arXiv:0906.0927v2 [math.DG] 10 Jun 2009

A compactness theorem for scalar-flat metrics on manifolds with boundary

Sérgio Almaraz

June 10, 2009

Abstract

Let (M^n,g) be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary ∂M. This paper is concerned with the set of scalar-flat metrics which are in the conformal class of g and have ∂M as a constant mean curvature hypersurface. We prove that this set is compact for dimensions $n\geq 7$ under the generic condition that the trace-free 2nd fundamental form of ∂M is nonzero everywhere.

1 Introduction

In 1960, H. Yamabe ([42]) raised the following question:

YAMABE PROBLEM: *Given (M^n,g), a compact Riemannian manifold (without boundary) of dimension $n\geq 3$, is there a Riemannian metric, conformal to g, with constant scalar curvature?*

This question was affirmatively answered after the works of Yamabe himself, N. Trudinger ([41]), T. Aubin ([3]) and R. Schoen ([36]). (See [27] and [39] for nice surveys on the issue.)

In 1992, J. Escobar ([18]) studied the following Yamabe-type problem, for manifolds with boundary:

YAMABE PROBLEM (boundary version): *Given (M^n,g), a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n\geq 3$ with boundary, is there a Riemannian metric, conformal to g, with zero scalar curvature and constant boundary mean curvature?*

In analytical terms, the problem proposed by Escobar corresponds to finding a positive solution to

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = 0, & \text{in } M,\\ B_g u + K u^{\frac{n}{n-2}} = 0, & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

for some constant K, where $L_g=\Delta_g-\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_g$ is the conformal Laplacian and $B_g=\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}-\frac{n-2}{2}h_g$. Here, Δ_g is the Laplace-Beltrami operator, R_g is the scalar curvature, h_g is the mean curvature of ∂M and η is the inward unit normal vector to ∂M.

The solutions of the equations (1.1) are the critical points of the functional

$$Q(u) = \frac{\int_M |\nabla_g u|^2 + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g u^2 dv_g + \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial M} h_g u^2 d\sigma_g}{\left(\int_{\partial M} u^{\frac{2(n-1)}{n-2}} d\sigma_g\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}},$$

where dv_g and $d\sigma_g$ denote the volume forms of M and ∂M, respectively. In order to prove the existence of solutions to the equations (1.1), Escobar introduced the conformally invariant Sobolev quotient

$$Q(M, \partial M) = \inf\{Q(u);\ u \in C^1(\bar{M}), u \not\equiv 0 \text{ on } \partial M\}.$$

The question of existence of solutions to the equations (1.1) was studied in [1], [18], [19], [20], [33] and [34]. Conformal metrics of constant scalar curvature and zero boundary mean curvature were studied by Escobar in [17] (see also [2] and [23]).

In the case of manifolds without boundary, the question of compactness of the full set of solutions to the Yamabe equation was first raised by R. Schoen ([37]) in a topics course at Stanford University in 1988. A necessary condition is that the manifold M^n is not conformally equivalent to the sphere S^n. This problem was studied in [14], [15], [28], [29], [31], [32], [38] and [40] and was completely solved in a series of three papers: [7], [8] and [26]. In [7], Brendle discovered the first smooth counterexamples for dimensions $n \geq 52$ (see [5] for nonsmooth examples). In [26], Khuri, Marques and Schoen proved compactness for dimensions $3 \leq n \leq 24$. Their proof contains both a local and a global aspect. The local aspect involves the vanishing of the Weyl tensor at any blow-up point and the global aspect involves the Positive Mass Theorem. Finally, in [8], Brendle and Marques extended the counterexamples of [7] to the remaining dimensions $25 \leq n \leq 51$. In [28], [29] and [32] the authors proved compactness for $n \geq 6$ under the condition that the Weyl tensor is nonzero everywhere.

In the present work we are interested in the compactness of the set of positive solutions to

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = 0, & \text{in } M, \\ B_g u + K u^p = 0, & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $1 < p \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$. A necessary condition is that M is not conformally equivalent to B^n. As stated by Escobar in [18], $Q(M, \partial M)$ is positive, zero or negative if the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(B_g)$ of the problem

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = 0, & \text{in } M, \\ B_g u + \lambda u = 0, & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

is positive, zero or negative, respectively. If $\lambda_1(B_g) < 0$, the solution to the equations (1.2) is unique. If $\lambda_1(B_g) = 0$, the equations (1.2) become linear and the solutions are unique up to a multiplication by a positive constant. Hence, the only interesting case is the one when $\lambda_1(B_g) > 0$.

We expect that, as in the case of manifolds without boundary, there should be counterexamples to compactness of the set of solutions to the equations (1.1) in high dimensions. In this work we address the question of whether compactness of these solutions holds generically in any dimension.

Our first result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold with dimension $n \geq 7$ and boundary ∂M. Assume that $Q(M, \partial M) > 0$. Let $\{u_i\}$ be a sequence of solutions to the equations (1.2) with $p = p_i \in [1 + \gamma_0, \frac{n}{n-2}]$ for any small fixed $\gamma_0 > 0$. Suppose there is a sequence $\{x_i\} \subset \partial M$, $x_i \to x_0$, of local maxima points of $u_i|_{\partial M}$ such that $u_i(x_i) \to \infty$. Then the trace-free 2nd fundamental form of ∂M vanishes at x_0.*

By linear elliptic theory, uniform estimates for the solutions of equation (1.2) imply $C^{k,\alpha}$-estimates, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. By the Harnack-type inequality of Lemma 9.3 (proved in [23]), uniform estimates on the boundary ∂M imply uniform estimates on M. Hence, an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 is a compactness theorem for Riemannian manifolds of dimension $n \geq 7$ that satisfy the condition that the boundary trace-free 2nd fundamental form is nonzero everywhere. More precisely:

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold with dimension $n \geq 7$ and boundary ∂M. Suppose $Q(M, \partial M) > 0$ and that the trace-free 2nd fundamental form of ∂M is nonzero everywhere. Given a small $\gamma_0 > 0$, there is $C > 0$ such that for any $u > 0$ and $p \in \left[1 + \gamma_0, \frac{n}{n-2}\right]$, solution to the equations (1.2), we have*

$$C^{-1} \leq u \leq C \quad \textit{and} \quad ||u||_{C^{2,\alpha}(M)} \leq C\,,$$

for some $0 < \alpha < 1$.

It was pointed out to me by F. Marques that a transversality argument implies that the second fundamental form condition above is generic for $n \geq 4$. In other words, the set of the Riemannian metrics on M^n such that the trace-free second fundamental form of ∂M is nonzero everywhere is open and dense in the space of all Riemannian metrics on M for $n \geq 4$.

We should mention that Theorem 1.2 does not use the Positive Mass Theorem, since the proof of Theorem 1.1 contains only a local argument, based in a Pohozaev-type identity.

The problem of compactness of solutions to the equations (1.2) was also studied by V. Felli and M. Ould Ahmedou in the conformally flat case with umbilic boundary ([20]) and in the three-dimensional case with umbilic boundary ([21]). Other compactness results for similar equations were obtained by Z. Han and Y. Li in [23] and by Z. Djadli, A. Malchiodi and M. Ould Ahmedou in [12] and [13].

A consequence of Theorem 1.2 is the computation of the total Leray-Schauder degree of all solutions to the equations (1.1), as in [20], [21] and [23] (see also [26]). When $\lambda_1(B_g) > 0$, we can define a map $F_p : \bar{\Omega}_\Lambda \to C^{2,\alpha}(M)$ by $F_p(u) = u + T(E(u)u^p)$. Here, T is the operator defined by $T(v) = u$, where u is the unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = 0, & \text{in } M\,, \\ B_g u = v, & \text{on } \partial M\,, \end{cases}$$

and $\Omega_\Lambda = \{u \in C^{2,\alpha}(M);\ |u|_{C^{2,\alpha}(M)} < \Lambda,\ u > \Lambda^{-1}\}$. From elliptic theory we know that the map $u \mapsto T(E(u)u^p)$ is compact from $\bar{\Omega}_\Lambda$ into $C^{2,\alpha}(M)$, where $E(u) = \int_M |\nabla_g u|^2 + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g u^2 dv_g + \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial M} h_g u^2 d\sigma_g$ is the energy of u. Hence, F_p is of the form I + compact. If $0 \neq F_p(\partial\Omega_\Lambda)$, we may define the Leray-Schauder degree (see [35]) of F_p in the region Ω_Λ with respect to $0 \in C^{2,\alpha}(M)$, denoted by $\deg(F_p, \Omega_\Lambda, 0)$. Observe that $F_p(u) = 0$ if and only if u is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = 0, & \text{in } M, \\ B_g u + E(u)u^p = 0, & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

Observe that these equations imply that $\int_{\partial M} u^{p+1} d\sigma_g = 1$. By the homotopy invariance of the degree, $\deg(F_p, \Omega_\Lambda, 0)$ is constant for all $p \in \left[1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right]$ provided that $0 \neq F_p(\partial\Omega_\Lambda)$ for all $p \in \left[1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right]$. In the linear case, when $p = 1$, we have $\deg(F_1, \Omega_\Lambda, 0) = -1$. This is the content of Lemma 4.2 of [20], which is a modification of the arguments in [23], pp.528-529. Thus, for Λ sufficiently large, Theorem 1.2 allow us to calculate the degree for all $p \in \left[1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right]$. Hence, we have:

Theorem 1.3. *Let (M^n, g) satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. Then, for Λ sufficiently large and all $p \in \left[1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right]$, we have $\deg(F_p, \Omega_\Lambda, 0) = -1$.*

We will now outline the proof of Theorem 1.1. The strategy of the proof is similar to the one proposed by Schoen in the case of manifolds without boundary. It is based on finding local obstructions to blow-up by means of a Pohozaev-type identity. We suppose that there is a simple blow-up point for a sequence $\{u_i\}$. We then approximate the sequence $\{u_i\}$ by the standard Euclidean solution plus a correction term ϕ_i. The function ϕ_i is defined as a solution to a non-homogeneous linear equation. We then use the Pohozaev identity to prove that the boundary trace-free 2nd fundamental form vanishes at the blow-up point. Finally we apply the Pohozaev identity to establish, after rescaling arguments, a sign condition that allows the reduction to the simple blow-up case.

An important part in our proof is the use of the correction term ϕ_i to obtain refined pointwise blow-up estimates. The idea of using a correction term first appeared in [24] and was significantly improved in [6]. This type of blow-up estimate was derived in [26] where the authors studied compactness in the case of manifolds without boundary. Although we do not have the kind of explicit control of the terms ϕ_i the authors had in [26], a key observation is that some orthogonality conditions are sufficient to obtain the vanishing of the boundary trace-free 2nd fundamental form.

In Section 2 we establish some notation and discuss some basic results. In Section 3 we prove the Pohozaev identity we will work with. In Section 4 we discuss the concepts of isolated and isolated simple blow-up points and state some basic properties. In Section 5 we find the correction term ϕ_i and prove its properties. In Section 6 we obtain the pointwise estimates for u_i. In Section 7 we prove the vanishing of the trace-free 2nd fundamental form at any isolated simple blow-up point and prove the Pohozaev sign condition. In Section 8 we reduce our analysis to the case of isolated simple blow-up points and prove Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements. The content of this paper is a part of the author's doctoral thesis ([1]). The author would like to express his gratitude to his advisor Prof. Fernando C. Marques for numerous mathematical conversations and constant encouragement. While the author was at IMPA, he was fully supported by CNPq-Brazil.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notations

Throughout this work we will make use of the index notation for tensors, commas denoting covariant differentiation. We will adopt the summation convention whenever confusion is not possible. When dealing with coordinates on manifolds with boundary, we will use indices $1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq a, b, c, d \leq n$. Lines under or over an object mean the restriction of the metric to the boundary is involved.

We will denote by g the Riemannian metric and set $\det g = \det g_{ab}$. We will denote by ∇_g or ∇ the covariant derivative and by Δ_g or Δ the Laplacian-Beltrami operator. The full curvature tensor will be denoted by R_{abcd}, the Ricci tensor by R_{ab} and the scalar curvature by R_g or R. The second fundamental form of the boundary will be denoted by h_{kl} and the mean curvature, $\frac{1}{n-1}tr(h_{kl})$, by h_g or h. By π_{kl} we will denote the trace-free second fundamental form, $h_{kl} - h\bar{g}_{kl}$.

By $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ we will denote the half-space $\{y = (y_1, ..., y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n;\ y_n \geq 0\}$. If $y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ we set $\bar{y} = (y_1, ..., y_{n-1}) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cong \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We will denote by $B^+_\delta(0)$ (or simply by B^+_δ) the halfball $B_\delta(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+$, where $B_\delta(0)$ is the Euclidean open ball of radius $\delta > 0$ centered at the origin. Given a subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n_+$, we set $\partial^+ A = \partial A \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+$ and $\partial' A = \partial A \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$.

In various parts of the text, we will identify a point $x_0 \in \partial M$ with the origin of $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, that meaning we are making use of Fermi coordinates $\varphi : B^+_\delta(0) \to M$, centered at x_0. In that case, we will sometimes write $B^+_\delta(x_0)$ or $B^+_\delta(0)$ instead of $\varphi(B^+_\delta(0))$.

The volume forms of M and ∂M will be denoted by dv_g and $d\sigma_g$, respectively.

By η we will denote the inward unit normal vector to ∂M. Finally, σ_n will denote the area of the n-dimensional unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $|\cdot|$ the Euclidean norm.

2.2 Standard solutions in the Euclidean half-space

In this section we will study the Euclidean Yamabe equation in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ and its linearization.

The simplest example of solution to the Yamabe problem is the ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the canonical Euclidean metric. This ball is conformally equivalent to the half-space $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ by the inversion $F:\mathbb{R}^n_+\to B^n\backslash\{(0,...,0,-1)\}$ with respect to the sphere $S^{n-1}_1(0,...,0,-1)$ with center $(0,...,0,-1)$ and radius 1. Here, $B^n = B_{1/2}(0,...,0,-1/2)$ is the Euclidean ball in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with center $(0,...,0,-1/2)$ and radius $1/2$. The expression for F is

$$F(y_1,...y_n)=\frac{(y_1,...,y_{n-1},y_n+1)}{y_1^2+...+y_{n-1}^2+(y_n+1)^2}+(0,...,0,-1)\,,$$

and of course its inverse mapping F^{-1} has the same expression. An easy calculation shows that F is a conformal map and $F^*g_{eucl}=U^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g_{eucl}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, where g_{eucl} is the Euclidean metric and $U(y)=(y_1^2+...+y_{n-1}^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}$. The function U satisfies

$$\begin{cases}\Delta U=0\,, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+\,,\\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial y_n}+(n-2)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}=0\,, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\,.\end{cases}\tag{2.1}$$

Since the equations (2.1) are invariant by horizontal translations and scalings with respect to the origin, we get the following family of solutions to the equation (2.1):

$$U_{\lambda,z}(y)=\left(\frac{\lambda}{(\lambda+y_n)^2+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}(y_j-z_j)^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\,,\tag{2.2}$$

where $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ and $z=(z_1,...,z_{n-1})\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

In fact, the converse statement is also true: by a Liouville-type theorem in [30] (see also [16] and [11]), any non-negative solution to the equations (2.1) is of the form (2.2) or is identically zero.

The existence of the family of solutions (2.2) has two important consequences. First, we see that the set of solutions to the equations (2.1) is non-compact. In particular, the set of solutions to the equations (1.1) is not compact when M^n is conformally equivalent to B^n. Secondly, the functions $\frac{\partial U}{\partial y_j}$, for $j=1,...,n-1$, and $\frac{n-2}{2}U+y^b\frac{\partial U}{\partial y^b}$, are solutions to the following homogeneous linear problem:

$$\begin{cases}\Delta\psi=0\,, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+\,,\\ \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial y_n}+nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\psi=0\,, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\,.\end{cases}\tag{2.3}$$

Notation We set $\psi_j = \frac{\partial U}{\partial y_j}$, for $j = 1, ..., n-1$, and $\psi_n = \frac{n-2}{2}U + y^b \frac{\partial U}{\partial y^b}$.

Now, we will show that linear combinations of $\psi_1, ..., \psi_n$ are the only solutions to the equations (2.3) under a certain decay hypothesis. This result is similar to the one obtained in [9] for the case of manifols without boundary. More precisely we have:

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose ψ is a solution to*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\psi = 0\,, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y_n} + nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\psi = 0\,, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\,. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

If $\psi(y) = O((1+|y|)^{-\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 0$, then there exist constants $c_1, ..., c_n$ such that

$$\psi(y) = \sum_{a=1}^{n} c_a \psi_a(y)\,.$$

The following result will be used in the proof of Lemma 2.1:

Lemma 2.2. *The eigenvalues λ of the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\bar{\psi} = 0\,, & \text{in } B^n\,, \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\psi}}{\partial \eta} + \lambda\bar{\psi} = 0\,, & \text{on } \partial B^n \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

are given by $\{\lambda_k = 2k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$. The corresponding eigenvectors are the harmonic homogeneous polynomials of degree k restricted to B^n. Here, the coefficients of the polynomials are given by the coordinate functions of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with center $(0, ..., 0, -1/2)$. In particular, the constant function 1 generates the eigenspace associated to the eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = 0$ and the coordinate functions $z_1, ..., z_n$ restricted to B^n generate the eigenspace associated to the eigenvalue λ_1.

Moreover, F takes z_j to $\frac{-1}{n-2}U^{-1}\psi_j$, for $j = 1, ..., n-1$, and z_n to $\frac{1}{n-2}U^{-1}\psi_n$.

Proof. The first part is an easy consequence of the fact that the spherical harmonics generate $L^2(S^{n-1})$. The last part is a straightforward computation. □

Proof of Lemma 2.1. The equations (2.4) are equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\bar{\psi} = 0\,, & \text{in } B^n \backslash \{(0, ..., 0, -1)\}\,, \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\psi}}{\partial \eta} + 2\bar{\psi} = 0\,, & \text{on } \partial B^n \backslash \{(0, ..., 0, -1)\}\,, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\psi} = U^{-1}\psi$. The hypothesis $\psi(y) = O((1+|y|)^{-\alpha})$, $0 < \alpha < n-2$ implies that $\bar{\psi} \in L^p(B^n)$, for any $\frac{n}{n-2} < p < \frac{n}{n-2-\alpha}$. Lemma 9.1 ensures that $\bar{\psi}$ is a weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\bar{\psi} = 0\,, & \text{in } B^n\,, \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\psi}}{\partial \eta} + 2\bar{\psi} = 0\,, & \text{on } \partial B^n\,. \end{cases}$$

It follows from elliptic theory that $\bar{\psi} \in C^\infty(B^n)$. In other words, ψ is a solution to the equations (2.4) if and only if $\bar{\psi}$ is an eigenfunction associated to the first nontrivial eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = 2$ of the problem (2.5). The result now follows from Lemma 2.2. □

2.3 Coordinate expansions for the metric

In this section we will write expansions for the metric g in Fermi coordinates. We will also recall the conformal Fermi coordinates, introduced by Marques in [33], that will simplify the computations in the next chapters. The conformal Fermi coordinates play the same role that the conformal normal coordinates (see [27]) did in the case of manifolds without boundary.

Definition 2.1. Let $x_0 \in \partial M$. We choose geodesic normal coordinates $(x_1, ..., x_{n-1})$ on the boundary, centered at x_0. We say that $(x_1, ..., x_n)$, for small $x_n \geq 0$, are the Fermi coordinates (centered at x_0) of the point $\exp_x(x_n\eta(x)) \in M$. Here, we denote by $\eta(x)$ the inward unit vector normal to ∂M at $x \in \partial M$.

It is easy to see that in these coordinates $g_{nn} \equiv 1$ and $g_{jn} \equiv 0$, for $j = 1, ..., n-1$.

Fix $x_0 \in \partial M$. Using Fermi coordinates centered at x_0, we work in $B^+_\delta(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n_+$, for some small $\delta > 0$.

Notation Set

$$|\partial^r g| = \max_{x \in B^+_\delta(0)} \sum_{|\alpha|=r} \sum_{a,b=1}^{n} |\partial^\alpha g_{ab}|(x)\,,$$

where α denotes a multiindex. We write $|\partial g| = |\partial^1 g|$ for short.

The following proposition gives the expansion for the Riemannian metric g in Fermi coordinates:

Proposition 2.1. *For $x \in B^+_\delta(0)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} g^{ij}(x) = {} & \delta_{ij} + 2h_{ij}(x_0)x_n + \frac{1}{3}\bar{R}_{ikjl}(x_0)x_k x_l + 2h_{ij;\underline{k}}(x_0)x_n x_k \\ & + (R_{ninj} + 3h_{ik}h_{kj})(x_0)x_n^2 + O(|\partial^3 g||x|^3). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This is proved as in Lemma 2.2 of [33]. □

The existence of conformal Fermi coordinates and some of its consequences are stated as follows:

Proposition 2.2. *For any given integer $N \geq 1$, there is a metric $\tilde{g}$, conformal to g, such that in $\tilde{g}$-Fermi coordinates centered at x_0,*

$$\det \tilde{g} = 1 + O(|x|^N)\,.$$

Moreover, $\tilde{g}$ can be writen as $\tilde{g} = fg$, $f > 0$, with $f(0) = 1$ and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k}(0) = 0$ for $k = 1, ..., n-1$. We also have

(i) $\bar{R}_{ij}(x_0) = \bar{R}_{ij;\underline{k}}(x_0) = 0$;
(ii) $R_{nn}(x_0) + (h_{ij})^2(x_0) = 0$;
(iii) $h(x) = O(|x|^N)$, where N can be taken arbirarily large.

Proof. The first part is Proposition 3.1 of [33]. Items (i) and (ii) are proved as in Proposition 3.2 of the same paper. Item (iii) follows from the fact that

$$h_g = \frac{-1}{2(n-1)} g^{ij} g_{ij,n} = \frac{-1}{2(n-1)} (\log \det g)_{,n}\,.$$

□

2.4 Conformal scalar and mean curvature equations

In this section we will introduce the partial differential equation we will work with in the next sections. We will also discuss some of its properties related to conformal deformation of metrics.

Let u be a positive smooth solution to

$$\begin{cases} L_g u = 0, & \text{in } M, , \\ B_g u + (n-2) f^{-\tau} u^p = 0, & \text{on } \partial M\,, \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

where $\tau = \frac{n}{n-2} - p$, $1 + \gamma_0 \leq p \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$ for some fixed $\gamma_0 > 0$ and f is a positive function. The equations (2.6) have an important scaling invariance property. Fix $x_0 \in \partial M$. Let $\delta > 0$ be small. Given $s > 0$ define the renormalized function

$$v(y) = s^{\frac{1}{p-1}} u(sy)\,, \quad \text{for } y \in B^+_{\delta s^{-1}}(0)\,.$$

Here, we work with Fermi coordinates centered at x_0. Then

$$\begin{cases} L_{\hat{g}} v = 0, & \text{in } B^+_{\delta s^{-1}}(0)\,, \\ B_{\hat{g}} v + (n-2) \hat{f}^{-\tau} v^p = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_{\delta s^{-1}}(0)\,, \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{f}(y) = f(sy)$ and the coefficients of the metric $\hat{g}$ in Fermi coordinates are given by $\hat{g}_{kl}(y) = g_{kl}(sy)$.

Notation We say that $u \in \mathcal{M}_p$ if u is a positive smooth solution to the equations (2.6).

The reason to work with the equations (2.6) instead of the equations (1.2) is that the first one has an important conformal invariance property. Suppose $\tilde{g} = \phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ is a metric conformal to g. Recall that the conformal Laplacian satisfies

$$L_{\phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g} (\phi^{-1} u) = \phi^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} L_g u, \tag{2.7}$$

for any smooth functions $\phi > 0$ and u. Similarly, the boundary operator B_g satisfies

$$B_{\phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g} (\phi^{-1} u) = \phi^{-\frac{n}{n-2}} B_g u\,. \tag{2.8}$$

Hence, if u is a solution to the equations (2.6), then $\phi^{-1} u$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_{\tilde{g}} (\phi^{-1} u) = 0, & \text{in } M\,, \\ B_{\tilde{g}} (\phi^{-1} u) + (n-2)(\phi f)^{-\tau} (\phi^{-1} u)^p = 0, & \text{on } \partial M\,, \end{cases}$$

which is again equations of the same type.

Notation Let $\Omega \subset M$ be a domain in a Riemannian manifold (M, g). Let $\{g_i\}$ be a sequence of metrics on M. We say that $u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i$ if u_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_{g_i}u_i = 0, & \text{in } \Omega\,, \\ B_{g_i}u_i + (n-2)f_i^{-\tau_i}u_i^{p_i} = 0, & \text{on } \partial'\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

where $\tau_i = \frac{n}{n-2} - p_i$ and $1 + \gamma_0 \leq p_i \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$ for some fixed $\gamma_0 > 0$.

In this chapter we will work with sequences $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$ and assume $f_i \to f > 0$ uniformly, and $g_i \to g_0$ in $C^2(M)$ for some metric g_0.

By the conformal invariance stated above, we are allowed to replace the metric g_i by $\phi_i^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g_i$ as long as we have control of the conformal factors ϕ_i. In this case we replace the sequence $\{u_i\}$ by $\{\phi_i^{-1}u_i\}$ which we also denote by $\{u_i\}$. In particular, we can use conformal Fermi coordinates centered at some point $x_i \in \partial M$.

3 A Pohozaev-type identity

In this section we prove the Pohozaev-type identity we will use in the subsequent blow-up analysis.

Proposition 3.1. *Let u be a solution to*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_g u = 0\,, & \text{in } B^+_\delta\,, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial y_n} - \frac{n-2}{2}h_g u + Kf^{-\tau}u^p = 0\,, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_\delta\,, \end{cases}$$

where K is a constant. Let $0 < r < \delta$. Set

$$P(u,r) = \int_{\partial^+B_r^+}\left(\frac{n-2}{2}u\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} - \frac{r}{2}|\nabla u|^2 + r\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^2\right)d\sigma_r + \frac{r}{p+1}\int_{\partial(\partial' B_r^+)}Kf^{-\tau}u^{p+1}d\bar\sigma_r\,.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} P(u,r) = &-\int_{B_r^+}\left(x^a\partial_a u + \frac{n-2}{2}u\right)A_g(u)dx + \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{\partial' B_r^+}\left(\bar x^k\partial_k u + \frac{n-2}{2}u\right)h_g u d\bar x \\ &- \frac{\tau}{p+1}\int_{\partial' B_r^+}K(\bar x^k\partial_k f)f^{-\tau-1}u^{p+1}d\bar x + \left(\frac{n-1}{p+1} - \frac{n-2}{2}\right)\int_{\partial' B_r^+}Kf^{-\tau}u^{p+1}d\bar x\,, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_g = \Delta_g - \Delta - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_g$.

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r^+}(x^b\partial_b u)\partial_{aa}u dx + \int_{B_r^+}\delta^{ab}(\partial_b u)(\partial_a u)dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_r^+}x^b\partial_b(\partial_a u)^2 dx \\ = \frac{1}{r}\int_{\partial^+B_r^+}(x^b\partial_b u)(x^a\partial_a u)d\sigma_r - \int_{\partial' B_r^+}(\bar x^k\partial_k u)(\partial_a u)\delta^a_n d\bar x\,. \end{aligned}$$

Summing in $a = 1, ..., n$ we obtain

$$\int_{B_r^+} (x^b \partial_b u) \Delta u dx + \int_{B_r^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \int_{B_r^+} x^b \partial_b (\partial_a u)^2 dx$$
$$= r \int_{\partial^+ B_r^+} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right|^2 d\sigma_r - \int_{\partial' B_r^+} (\bar{x}^k \partial_k u)(\partial_n u) d\bar{x} \,. \quad (3.1)$$

But, integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \int_{B_r^+} x^b \partial_b (\partial_a u)^2 dx &= -\frac{n}{2} \sum_a \int_{B_r^+} (\partial_a u)^2 dx + \frac{r}{2} \sum_a \int_{\partial^+ B_r^+} (\partial_a u)^2 d\sigma_r \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \int_{\partial' B_r^+} x^b \delta_b^n (\partial_a u)^2 d\bar{x} \\ &= -\frac{n}{2} \int_{B_r^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{r}{2} \int_{\partial^+ B_r^+} |\nabla u|^2 d\sigma_r \,, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} (\bar{x}^k \partial_k u)(\partial_n u) d\bar{x} &= -\int_{\partial' B_r^+} (\bar{x}^k \partial_k u)(K f^{-\tau} u^p - \frac{n-2}{2} h_g u) d\bar{x} \\ &= -\frac{1}{p+1} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} K \bar{x}^k \partial_k (u^{p+1}) f^{-\tau} d\bar{x} \\ &\quad + \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} (\bar{x}^k \partial_k u) h_g u d\bar{x} \\ &= \frac{n-1}{p+1} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} K f^{-\tau} u^{p+1} d\bar{x} + \frac{1}{p+1} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} K (\bar{x}^k \partial_k f^{-\tau}) u^{p+1} d\bar{x} \\ &\quad - \frac{r}{p+1} \int_{\partial(\partial' B_r^+)} K f^{-\tau} u^{p+1} d\bar{\sigma}_r \\ &\quad + \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} (\bar{x}^k \partial_k u) h_g u d\bar{x} \,. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Substituting equalities (3.2) and (3.3) in (3.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_r^+} (x^b \partial_b u) \Delta u dx - \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{B_r^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{r}{2} \int_{\partial^+ B_r^+} |\nabla u|^2 d\sigma_r \\ &= r \int_{\partial^+ B_r^+} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right|^2 d\sigma_r - \frac{n-1}{p+1} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} K f^{-\tau} u^{p+1} d\bar{x} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{p+1} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} K (\bar{x}^k \partial_k f^{-\tau}) u^{p+1} d\bar{x} + \frac{r}{p+1} \int_{\partial(\partial' B_r^+)} K f^{-\tau} u^{p+1} d\bar{\sigma}_r \\ &\quad - \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial' B_r^+} (\bar{x}^k \partial_k u) h_g u d\bar{x} \,. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Using

$$\int_{B_r^+} |\nabla u|^2 dx = -\int_{B_r^+} u\Delta u dx + \int_{\partial^+ B_r^+} u\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} d\sigma_r + \int_{\partial' B_r^+} (Kf^{-\tau}u^{p+1} - \frac{n-2}{2}h_g u^2)d\bar{x}$$

and $\Delta u = -A_g(u)$ in equality (3.4) we get the result. □

4 Isolated and isolated simple blow-up points

In this section, we will discuss the notions of isolated and isolated simple blow-up points and prove some of their properties. These notions are slight modifications of the ones used by Felli and Ould Ahmedou in [20] and [21] and are inspired by similar definitions in the case of manifolds without boundary.

Definition 4.1. Let $\Omega \subset M$ be a domain in a Riemannian manifold (M, g). We say $x_0 \in \partial'\Omega$ is a blow-up point for the sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, if there is a sequence $\{x_i\} \subset \partial'\Omega$ such that

(1) $x_i \to x_0$;

(2) $u_i(x_i) \to \infty$;

(3) x_i is a local maximum of $u_i|_{\partial M}$.

Briefly we say that $x_i \to x_0$ is a blow-up point for $\{u_i\}$. The sequence $\{u_i\}$ is called a blow-up sequence.

Convention If $x_i \to x_0$ is a blow-up point, we work in $B_\delta^+(0) \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, for some small $\delta > 0$, using g_i-Fermi coordinates centered at x_i.

Notation If $x_i \to x_0$ is a blow-up point we set $M_i = u_i(x_i)$, $\epsilon_i = M_i^{-(p_i-1)}$.

4.1 Isolated blow-up points

We define the notion of an isolated blow-up point as follows:

Definition 4.2. We say that $x_i \to x_0$ is an isolated blow-up point if it is a blow-up point and there exist $\delta, C > 0$ such that

$$u_i(x) \leq C|x|^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial' B_\delta^+(0) \backslash \{0\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Remark 4.1. Note that the definition of isolated blow-up point is invariant under renormalization, which was descrided in Section 2.4. This follows from the fact that if $v_i(y) = s^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} u_i(sy)$, then

$$u_i(x) \leq C|x|^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}} \Longleftrightarrow v_i(y) \leq C|y|^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}},$$

where $x = sy$.

The first result concerning isolated blow-up points states that the inequality (4.1) also holds for points $x \in B_\delta^+(0) \backslash \{0\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated blow-up point. Then $\{u_i\}$ satisfies*

$$u_i(x) \leq C|x|^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\,, \quad \textit{for all } x \in B^+_\delta(0)\backslash\{0\}\,.$$

Proof. Let $0 < s < \frac{\delta}{3}$ and set $v_i(y) = s^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}u_i(sy)$ for $|y| < 3$. Then v_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_{\tilde{g}_i}v_i = 0, & \text{in } B^+_3(0),\\ (B_{\tilde{g}_i} + (n-2)\tilde{f}_i^{-\tau_i}v_i^{p_i-1})v_i = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_3(0)\,, \end{cases}$$

where $(\tilde{g}_i)_{kl}(y) = (g_i)_{kl}(sy)$ and $\tilde{f}(y) = f(sy)$. Hence, Lemma 9.3 gives

$$\max_{B^+_2(0)\backslash B^+_{1/2}(0)} v_i \leq C(n, \max_{\partial' B^+_3(0)} v_i) \min_{B^+_2(0)\backslash B^+_{1/2}(0)} v_i\,. \tag{4.2}$$

By the scaling invariance (Remark 4.1) v_i is uniformly bounded in compact subsets of $\partial' B^+_3(0)\backslash\{0\}$. Hence, the result follows from inequality (4.2). □

A corollary of the proof of Lemma 4.1 is the following Harnack-type inequality:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated blow-up point and δ as in Definition 4.2. Then $\exists C > 0$ such that $\forall 0 < s < \frac{\delta}{3}$,*

$$\max_{B^+_{2s}(0)\backslash B^+_{s/2}(0)} u_i \leq C \min_{B^+_{2s}(0)\backslash B^+_{s/2}(0)} u_i\,.$$

The next proposition says that, in the case of an isolated blow-up point, the sequence $\{u_i\}$, when renormalized, converges to the standard Euclidean solution U.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated blow-up point. Set*

$$v_i(y) = M_i^{-1}u_i(M_i^{-(p_i-1)}y)\,, \quad \textit{for } y \in B^+_{\delta M_i^{p_i-1}}(0)\,.$$

Then given $R_i \to \infty$ and $\beta_i \to 0$, after choosing subsequences, we have

(a) $|v_i - U|_{C^2(B^+_{R_i}(0))} < \beta_i$;
(b) $\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{R_i}{\log M_i} = 0$;
(c) $\lim_{i\to\infty} p_i = \frac{n}{n-2}$.

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is analogous to Lemma 2.6 of [20] or Proposition 4.3 of [32]. It uses the fact that, by the Liouville-type theorems of [25] and [30], every non-negative solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+,\\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_n} + (n-2)v^{p_0} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

for $1 < p_0 \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$, is either identically zero or is of the form (2.2), in which case $p_0 = \frac{n}{n-2}$.

Remark 4.2. Once we have proved Proposition 4.1 it is not difficult to see that, if we change the metric by an uniformly bounded conformal factor $f_i > 0$, with $f_i(0) = 1$ and $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_k}(0) = 0$ for $k = 1, ..., n-1$, then isolated blow-up points are preserved. This is the case of conformal Fermi coordinates, for example (see Proposition 2.2).

The following lemma will be used later when we consider the set of blow-up points.

Lemma 4.3. *Given $R, \beta > 0$, there exists $C_0 > 0$ such that if $u \in \mathcal{M}_p$ and $S \subset \partial M$ is a compact set, we have the following:*

If $\max_{x\in\partial M\backslash S}\left(u(x)d_{\bar g}(x,S)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right) \geq C_0$, then $\frac{n}{n-2} - p < \beta$ and there exists $x_0 \in \partial M\backslash S$, local maximum of u, such that

$$\left|u(x_0)^{-1}u(x) - U(u(x_0)^{p-1}x)\right|_{C^2(B^+_{2r_0}(x_0))} < \beta\,, \tag{4.4}$$

where $r_0 = Ru(x_0)^{-(p-1)}$. If $\emptyset$ is the empty set, we define $d_{\bar g}(x, \emptyset) = 1$.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that there exist $R, \beta > 0$ such that, for all $C_0 > 0$, there exist $u \in \mathcal{M}_p$ and $S \subset \partial M$ compact such that

$$\max_{x\in\partial M\backslash S}\left(u(x)d_{\bar g}(x,S)^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\right) \geq C_0$$

and there is no such point x_0. Hence, we can suppose that there are sequences

$$w_i(x_i') = \max_{x\in\partial M\backslash\ S_i} w_i(x) \to \infty,$$

where $w_i(x) = u_i(x)d_{\bar g}(x,S_i)^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}$ and $x_i' \in \partial M$. Here, $S_i \subset \partial M$ is compact. We assume that $p_i \to p_0$, for some $p_0 \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right]$, and $x_i' \to x_0'$ for some $x_0' \in \partial M$. Set $N_i = u_i(x_i')$. Observe that $N_i \to \infty$.

We use Fermi coordinates centered at x_i'. Set $v_i(y) = N_i^{-1}u_i(N_i^{-(p_i-1)}y)$ for $y \in B^+_{\delta N_i^{p_i-1}}(0)$. It follows from the discussion in Section 2.4 that v_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_{\hat g_i}v_i = 0\,, & \text{in } B^+_{\delta N_i^{p_i-1}}(0)\,,\\ B_{\hat g_i}v_i + (n-2)\hat f_i^{-\tau_i}v_i^{p_i} = 0\,, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_{\delta N_i^{p_i-1}}(0)\,,\end{cases}$$

where $\hat f_i(y) = f(N_i^{-(p_i-1)}y)$ and $\hat g_i$ stands for the metric with coefficients $(\hat g_i)_{kl}(y) = g_{kl}(N_i^{-(p_i-1)}y)$.

Claim $v_i \leq C$ in compacts of $\mathbb{R}^n_+$.

Let $x \in \partial' B^+_\delta(0)$. Since $w_i(x) \leq w_i(x_i')$, we have

$$\frac{d_{\bar g}(S_i, x_i') - d_{\bar g}(x_i', x)}{d_{\bar g}(S_i, x_i')} \leq \frac{d_{\bar g}(S_i, x)}{d_{\bar g}(S_i, x_i')} \leq \left(N_i u_i(x)^{-1}\right)^{p_i-1}\,.$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{d_{\bar{g}}(S_i, x_i') - d_{\bar{g}}(x_i', x)}{d_{\bar{g}}(S_i, x_i')} = 1 - \frac{N_i^{-(p_i-1)}|y|}{d_{\bar{g}}(S_i, x_i')} = 1 - w_i(x_i')^{-(p_i-1)}|y| = 1 - o_i(1)|y|,$$

where we have set $y = N_i^{p_i-1}x$. This proves that $v_i \leq C$ in compacts of $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$. Now the Claim follows from Lemma 9.3.

Hence, we can suppose that $v_i \to v$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$, for $v > 0$ satisfying the equations (4.3) and $v(0) = 1$. Then, by the Liouville-type theorems of [25] and [30], $p_0 = \frac{n}{n-2}$ and v is of the form (2.2). Hence, we can find $y_{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{\delta N_i^{p_i-1}}(0)$ local maxima of v_i, such that $y_{(i)} \to (z_1, ..., z_{n-1}, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Then, after a renormalization such that $v_i(y_{(i)}) = 1$, v_i satisfies the estimate (4.4), for i large, with $x_0 = N_i^{-(p_i-1)}y_{(i)}$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

Once we have proved Lemma 4.3, the proof of the following proposition is analogous to Proposition 5.1 of [31] (see also Lemma 3.1 of [40] or Proposition 1.1 of [23]):

Proposition 4.2. *Given small $\beta > 0$ and large $R > 0$ there are constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$, depending only on β, R and (M^n, g), such that if $u \in \mathcal{M}_p$ and $\max_{\partial M} u \geq C_0$, then $\frac{n}{n-2} - p < \beta$ and there are $x_1, ..., x_N \in \partial M$ local maxima of u, such that:*

(1) If $r_j = Ru(x_j)^{-(p-1)}$ for $j = 1, ..., N$, then $\{\partial' B^+_{r_j}(x_j) \subset \partial M\}_{j=1}^N$ is a disjoint collection;

(2) For $j = 1, ..., N$, $\quad \left| u(x_j)^{-1}u(x) - U(u(x_j)^{p-1}x) \right|_{C^2(B^+_{2r_j}(x_j))} < \beta$;

(3) We have

$$u(x)\, d_{\bar{g}}(x, \{x_1, ..., x_N\})^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \leq C_1\,, \quad \textit{for all } x \in \partial M\,,$$

$$u(x_j)\, d_{\bar{g}}(x_j, x_k)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \geq C_0\,, \quad \textit{for any } j \neq k\,.$$

4.2 Isolated simple blow-up points

Let us introduce the notion of an isolated simple blow-up point. Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated blow-up point. Set

$$\bar{u}_i(r) = \frac{2}{\sigma_{n-1}r^{n-1}} \int_{\partial^+ B^+_r(0)} u_i d\sigma_r$$

and $w_i(r) = r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\bar{u}_i(r)$.

Note that the definition of w_i is invariant under renormalization, which was descrided in Section 2.4. More precisely, if $v_i(y) = s^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}u_i(sy)$, then

$$r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\bar{v}_i(r) = (sr)^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\bar{u}_i(sr)\,.$$

Definition 4.3. An isolated blow-up point $x_i \to x_0$ is simple if there is $\delta > 0$ such that w_i has exactly one critical point in $(0, \delta)$.

Remark 4.3. Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated blow-up point and $R_i \to \infty$. Using Proposition 4.1 it is not difficult to see that, choosing a subsequence, $r \mapsto r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} \bar{u}_i(r)$ has exactly one critical point in $(0, r_i)$. Moreover, its derivative is negative right after the critical point. Hence, if $x_i \to x_0$ is isolated simple then there is $\delta > 0$ such that $w_i'(r) < 0$ for all $r \in [r_i, \delta)$.

The next proposition is an important property of isolated simple blow-up points.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated simple blow-up point. Then there exists $C, \delta > 0$ such that*

(a) $M_i u_i(x) \leq C|x|^{2-n}$ for all $x \in B^+_\delta(0) \backslash \{0\}$;

(b) $M_i u_i(x) \geq C^{-1} G_i(x)$ for all $x \in B^+_\delta(0) \backslash B^+_{r_i}(0)$, where G_i is the Green's function so that:

$$\begin{cases} L_{g_i} G_i = 0, & \text{in } B^+_\delta(0)\backslash\{0\}, \\ G_i = 0, & \text{on } \partial^+ B^+_\delta(0), \\ B_{g_i} G_i = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_\delta(0) \end{cases}$$

and $|x|^{n-2} G_i(x) \to 1$, as $|x| \to 0$.

For the proof of Proposition 4.3 we will use the following lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated simple blow-up point and let ρ be small. Then there exist $C, \delta > 0$ such that*

$$M_i^{\lambda_i} |\nabla^r u_i|(x) \leq C|x|^{2-r-n+\rho},$$

for $x \in B^+_\delta(0)$ and $r = 0, 1, 2$. Here, $\lambda_i = (p_i - 1)(n - 2 - \rho) - 1$.

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is analogous to Lemma 2.7 of [20]. It uses the following maximum principle of [23] (Lemma A.2):

Lemma 4.5. *Let (N, g) be a Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset N$ be a connected open set with piecewise smooth boundary $\partial\Omega = \Gamma \cup \Sigma$. Let $h \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\sigma \in L^\infty(\Sigma)$. Suppose that $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, $u > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u + hu \leq 0\,, & \text{in } \Omega\,, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \sigma u \leq 0\,, & \text{on } \Sigma \end{cases}$$

and $v \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g v + hv \leq 0\,, & \text{in } \Omega\,, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} + \sigma v \leq 0\,, & \text{on } \Sigma\,, \\ v \geq 0\,, & \text{on } \Gamma\,, \end{cases}$$

where ν denotes the unit normal of Σ pointing inwards. Then $v \geq 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Remark 4.4. Set $v_i(y) = M_i^{-1}u_i(M_i^{-(p_i-1)}y)$ and suppose that $x_i \to x_0$ is isolated simple. Then, as a consequence of Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.1, we see that there is $C > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla^r v_i|(y) \leq CM_i^{\rho(p_i-1)}(1+|y|)^{2-r-n}$$

for any $y \in B^+_{\delta M_i^{p_i-1}}(0)$ and $r = 0, 1, 2$.

Now we are going to estimate τ_i.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated simple blow-up point and let $\rho > 0$ be small. Then there is $C > 0$ such that*

$$\tau_i \leq \begin{cases} C\epsilon_i^{1-2\rho+o_i(1)}, & \text{for } n \geq 5, \\ C\epsilon_i^{1-2\rho+o_i(1)}\log(\epsilon_i), & \text{for } n = 4. \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. We write the Pohozaev identity of Proposition 3.1 as

$$P(u_i, r) = F_i(u_i, r) + \bar{F}_i(u_i, r) + \frac{\tau_i}{p_i+1}Q_i(u_i, r), \tag{4.6}$$

for $r \leq \delta$, where
$F_i(u,r) = -\int_{B_r^+}(x^b\partial_b u + \frac{n-2}{2}u)(L_{g_i} - \Delta)u\,dx$,
$\bar{F}_i(u,r) = \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{\partial' B_r^+}(\bar{x}^b\partial_b u + \frac{n-2}{2}u)h_{g_i}u\,d\bar{x}$,
$Q_i(u,r) = \frac{(n-2)^2}{2}\int_{\partial' B_r^+} f_i^{-\tau_i}u^{p_i+1}d\bar{x} - (n-2)\int_{\partial' B_r^+}(\bar{x}^k\partial_k f)f_i^{-\tau_i-1}u^{p_i+1}d\bar{x}$.

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that we can choose a subsequence such that

$$\int_{\partial' B_{r_i}^+} u_i^{p_i-1} \geq c > 0,$$

where $r_i = R_i\epsilon_i \to 0$. Hence, for $r > 0$ small, $Q_i(u_i, r) \geq c > 0$.

Using Lemma 4.4 we obtain

$$P_i(u_i, r) \leq C\epsilon_i^{\frac{2\lambda_i}{p_i-1}} = C\epsilon_i^{n-2-2\rho+o_i(1)}. \tag{4.7}$$

Changing variables,

$$\bar{F}_i(u_i, r) = -\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{p_i-1}+n-2}\int_{\partial' B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\left(\bar{y}^b\partial_b v_i + \frac{n-2}{2}v_i\right)h_{g_i}(\epsilon_i\bar{y})v_i(\bar{y})d\bar{y}.$$

Observe that $-\frac{2}{p_i-1} + n - 2 = -(n-2)\frac{\tau_i}{p_i-1} = o_i(1)$. By Remark 4.4 and the fact that we can suppose that $h(0) = 0$ (see Proposition 2.2 (iii)),

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_i(u_i, r) &= \epsilon_i^{-2\rho+o_i(1)}\int_{\partial' B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|\bar{y}|)^{2-n})O(\epsilon_i|\bar{y}|)O((1+|\bar{y}|)^{2-n})d\bar{y} \\ &\geq -C\epsilon_i^{1-2\rho+o_i(1)} \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } n \geq 5, \\ \log\epsilon_i, & \text{for } n = 4. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_i(u_i, r) &= -\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{p_i-1}+n-2} \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} (y^b \partial_b v_i + \frac{n-2}{2} v_i)(L_{\hat{g}_i} - \Delta) v_i dy \\
&= \epsilon_i^{-2\rho+o_i(1)} \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{2-n}) O(\epsilon_i |y|) O((1+|y|)^{-n}) dy
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, $F_i(u_i, r) \geq -C\epsilon_i^{1-2\rho+o_i(1)}$, for $n \geq 4$. This, together with the identities (4.6), (4.7), (4.8) and the fact that $Q_i(u_i, r) \geq c > 0$, gives the result. □

Now, we are able to prove Proposition 4.3.

Proof of Proposition 4.3. We will first need the following two claims.

Claim 1 Given a small $\sigma > 0$, there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\partial' B^+_\sigma} u_i^{p_i} d\bar{x} \leq C M_i^{-1} .$$

If follows from Proposition 4.1 that we can choose a subsequence such that

$$\int_{\partial' B^+_{r_i}} u_i^{p_i}(\bar{x}) d\bar{x} = M_i^{-(p_i-1)(n-1)+p_i} \int_{\partial' B^+_{R_i}} v_i(\bar{y})^{p_i} d\bar{y} \leq C M_i^{-1} .$$

Here, $r_i = R_i M_i^{-(p_i-1)}$ and $R_i \to \infty$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.4,

$$\int_{\partial' B^+_\sigma \backslash \partial' B^+_{r_i}} u_i^{p_i}(\bar{x}) d\bar{x} \leq C M_i^{-\lambda_i p_i} \int_{\partial' B^+_\sigma \backslash \partial' B^+_{r_i}} |\bar{x}|^{(2-n+\rho)p_i} d\bar{x} \leq o_i(1) M_i^{-1} .$$

This proves Claim 1.

Claim 2 There is $\sigma_1 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \sigma < \sigma_1$ there is $C = C(\sigma)$ such that

$$u_i(x) u_i(x_i) \leq C$$

for any $x \in \partial^+ B^+_\sigma(0)$.

It is not difficult to see that if $\sigma_1 > 0$ is small we can find a conformal metric, still denoted by g_i, such that $R_{g_i} \equiv 0$ in $B^+_{\sigma_1}(0)$ and $h_{g_i} \equiv 0$ on $\partial' B^+_{\sigma_1}(0)$.

We fix $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_1)$ and choose $x_\sigma \in \partial^+ B^+_\sigma(0)$.

If we set $w_i = u_i(x_\sigma)^{-1} u_i$, then w_i satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}
\Delta_{g_i} w_i = 0, & \text{in } B^+_\sigma(0)\,, \\
\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial \eta} + (n-2) u_i(x_\sigma)^{p_i-1} w_i^{p_i} = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_\sigma(0)\,.
\end{cases}
\tag{4.9}
$$

By the Harnack inequality of Lemma 9.3, for each $\beta > 0$ there is $C_\beta > 0$ such that

$$C_\beta^{-1} \leq w_i(x) \leq C_\beta$$

if $|x| > \beta$. Observe that Lemma 4.4 implies that $u_i(x_\sigma)^{p_i-1} \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Hence, we can suppose that $w_i \to w > 0$ in $C^2_{loc}(B^+_\sigma(0)\backslash\{0\})$ and w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_0} w = 0, & \text{in } B^+_\sigma(0)\backslash\{0\}, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial \eta} = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_\sigma(0)\backslash\{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

Here, g_0 is the C^2-limit of g_i. It follows from elliptic linear theory that

$$w = aG(x) + b(x) \quad \text{for } x \in B^+_\sigma(0)\backslash\{0\}\,,$$

where $a \geq 0$. Here, G is the Green's function so that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_0} G = 0, & \text{in } B^+_\sigma(0)\backslash\{0\}, \\ G = 0, & \text{on } \partial^+ B^+_\sigma(0), \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial \eta} = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_\sigma(0)\backslash\{0\}, \\ \lim_{|x|\to 0} |x|^{2-n} G(x) = 1\,, \end{cases}$$

and b satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_0} b = 0, & \text{in } B^+_\sigma(0), \\ \frac{\partial b}{\partial \eta} = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_\sigma(0)\,. \end{cases}$$

We will prove that $a > 0$. Set $r = |x|$. Since the blow-up is isolated simple, $r \mapsto r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} \bar{u}_i(r)$ is decreasing in (r_i, σ) (see Remark 4.3). Taking the limit as $i \to \infty$, we conclude that $r \mapsto r^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \bar{w}(r)$ is decreasing in $(0, \sigma)$. Hence, w has a non-removable singularity at the origin. Therefore $a > 0$.

Fix $\delta > 0$ small. Then there is $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$-\int_{\partial^+ B^+_\delta} \frac{\partial w}{\partial r} d\sigma_r > c_1. \tag{4.11}$$

Integrating by parts the first equation of (4.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \int_{B^+_\delta} \Delta_{g_0} w_i dx &= \int_{\partial^+ B^+_\delta} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial r} d\sigma_\delta - \int_{\partial' B^+_\delta} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial \eta} d\bar{x} \\ &= \int_{\partial^+ B^+_\delta} \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial r} + o_i(1) \right) d\sigma_\delta + (n-2) u_i(x_\sigma)^{-1} \int_{\partial' B^+_\delta} u_i^{p_i} d\bar{x} \\ &\leq -c_1 + C u_i(x_\sigma)^{-1} u_i(x_i)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where we used the estimate (4.11) and Claim 1 in the last inequality. This proves Claim 2.

Now we are going to prove the item (a). Suppose by contradiction it does not hold. Then passing to a subsequence we can choose $\{x_i'\} \subset M$ such that $|x_i'| \to 0$ and

$$u_i(x_i)u_i(x_i')|x_i'|^{n-2} \to \infty. \tag{4.13}$$

By Proposition 4.1 we can assume that $R_i u_i(x_i)^{-(p_i-1)} \leq |x_i'| \leq \delta$ where $R_i \to \infty$. Set $v_i(y) = |x_i'|^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} u_i(|x_i'|\, y)$ for $y \in B^+_{\delta |x_i'|^{-1}}(0)$. Hence, the origin is an isolated simple blow-up point for $\{v_i\}$. Thus, by Claim 2, there is $C > 0$ such that

$$|x_i'|^{\frac{2}{p_i-1}} u_i(x_i)u_i(x_i') = v_i(0)v_i(y_i') \leq C$$

where $y_i' = |x_i'|^{-1}x_i'$. This contradicts the hypothesis (4.13).

Item (b) is just an application of Lemma 4.5. □

Remark 4.5. Set $v_i(y) = M_i^{-1}u_i(M_i^{-(p_i-1)}y)$ and suppose that $x_i \to x_0$ is isolated simple. Then, as a consequence of Propositions 4.1 and 4.3, we see that $v_i \leq CU$ in $B^+_{\delta M_i^{p_1-1}}(0)$.

5 The linearized equation

In this section we will be interested in solutions of a certain type of linear problem. These solutions will be used in the blow-up estimates of the next section.

Convention In this section, we will always use the conformal equivalence between $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ and B^n realized by the inversion F (see Section 2.2).

Let $r \mapsto \chi(r)$ be a smooth cut-off function such that $\chi(r) \equiv 1$ for $0 \leq r \leq \delta$ and $\chi(r) \equiv 0$ for $r > 2\delta$. Set $\chi_{\epsilon_i}(r) = \chi(\epsilon_i r)$. Thus, $\chi_{\epsilon_i}(r) \equiv 1$ for $0 \leq r \leq \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}$ and $\chi_{\epsilon_i}(r) \equiv 0$ for $r > 2\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $x_i \in \partial M$ and $0 < \epsilon_i \to 0$ be sequences and choose Fermi coordinates centered at each x_i. Then there is a solution ϕ_i to*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi_i(y) = -\chi_{\epsilon_i}(|y|)\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n (\partial_k\partial_l U)(y)\,, & \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+\,, \\ \frac{\partial\phi_i}{\partial y_n}(\bar{y}) + nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\phi_i(\bar{y}) = 0\,, & \text{for } \bar{y} \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+\,, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

satisfying

$$|\nabla^r \phi_i|(y) \leq C(r)\epsilon_i |h_{kl}(0)|(1+|y|)^{3-r-n}\,, \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+\,,\ r = 0,1,2\,, \tag{5.2}$$

$$\phi_i(0) = \frac{\partial\phi_i}{\partial y_1}(0) = \ldots = \frac{\partial\phi_i}{\partial y_{n-1}}(0) = 0\,, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(\bar{y})\phi_i(\bar{y})\,d\bar{y} = 0\,. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Set

$$f_i(F(y)) = -\chi_{\epsilon_i}(y)\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n (\partial_k \partial_l U)(y) U^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}(y) \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \, .$$

Observe that f_i can be extended as a smooth function to B^n and is $L^2(B^n)$-orthogonal to the coordinate functions $z_1, ..., z_n$, taken with center $(0, ..., 0, -1/2)$. To see this orthogonality, we use the conformal equivalence between B^n and $\mathbb{R}^n_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ and the fact that, for every homogeneous polynomial p_k of degree k, we have

$$\int_{S^{n-2}_r} p_k = \frac{r^2}{k(k+n-3)} \int_{S^{n-2}_r} \Delta p_k \, . \tag{5.5}$$

By Lemma 2.2 and elliptic linear theory, it is possible to find a smooth solution $\bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}$ to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i} = f_i \, , & \text{in } B^n \, , \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}}{\partial \eta} + 2\bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i} = 0 \, , & \text{on } \partial B^n \, , \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

also $L^2(B^n)$-ortogonal to the coordinate functions $z_1, ..., z_n$.

Set $D = \{(z, w) \in B^n \times B^n;\ z = w\}$. Let G be the Green's function so that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta G(z, w) = \sum_{a=1}^n q_a(w) z_a \, , & \text{in } (B^n \times B^n)\backslash D \, , \\ \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} + 2\right) G(z, w) = 0 \, , & \text{on } (\partial B^n \times \partial B^n)\backslash D \cap (\partial B^n \times \partial B^n) \, , \end{cases}$$

where Δ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}$ are taken with respect to z, and $|z-w|^{n-2} G(z, w) \to 1$ as $|z-w| \to 0$.

Then $\bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}$ satisfies

$$\bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}(z) = -\int_{B^n} G(z, w) f_i(w) dw \, .$$

Therefore,

$$|\bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}(z)| \leq C\epsilon_i |h_{kl}(0)| \int_{B^n} |z - w|^{2-n} |w + (0, ..., 0, 1)|^{-3} dw \, .$$

It follows from the result in [22], p.150 (see also [4], p.108) that

$$\bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}(z) \leq C\epsilon_i |h_{kl}(0)| |z + (0, ..., 0, 1)|^{-1} \leq C\epsilon_i |h_{kl}(0)| (|F(z)| + 1) \, .$$

Hence, $\phi_{\epsilon_i} = U \bar{\phi}_{\epsilon_i}$ satisfies the estimate (5.2). By the properties (2.7) and (2.8) of the operators L_g and B_g, ϕ_{ϵ_i} is a solution to the equations (5.1).

Now, we choose coefficients $c_{j,i} = \frac{1}{n-2} \frac{\partial \phi_{\epsilon_i}}{\partial y_j}(0)$, $j \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$, and $c_{n,i} = -\frac{2}{n-2} \phi_{\epsilon_i}(0)$ and define

$$\phi_i = \phi_{\epsilon_i} + \sum_{a=1}^{n} c_{a,i} \psi_a \, .$$

Then ϕ_i is also a solution to the equations (5.1) and satisfies the identity (5.3). Since ϕ_{ϵ_i} satisfies the estimate (5.2), we see that $|c_{a,i}| \leq C|h_{kl}(0)|\epsilon_i$ for $a = 1, ..., n$. Hence, ϕ_i also satisfies the estimate (5.2).

Let us prove the identity (5.4). Observe that $\bar{\phi}_i = U^{-1}\phi_i$ also satisfies the equations (5.6) and f_i is $L^2(B^n)$-ortogonal to the constant function 1. Hence, integrating by parts the first equation of (5.6) we see that $\bar{\phi}_i$ is $L^2(\partial B^n)$-ortogonal to the funcion 1. This is the identity (5.4). $\square$

The following result is an important estimate that will be used in the subsequent local blow-up analysis.

Proposition 5.2. *Let ϕ_i and ϵ_i be as in Proposition 5.1 and suppose that $n \geq 5$. Then ϕ_i satisfies*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \Big(y^b\partial_b\phi_i + \frac{n-2}{2}\phi_i\Big)\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\partial_l U\,dy \\
&\quad -\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \Big(y^b\partial_b U + \frac{n-2}{2}U\Big)\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\partial_l\phi_i\,dy \geq -C(n)|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Integrating by parts,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \Big(y^b\partial_b\phi_i + \frac{n-2}{2}\phi_i\Big)(\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\partial_l U)dy \\
&\geq \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy + \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n y_b\partial_b\partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy \\
&\quad + \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n} \qquad (5.7)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \Big(y^b\partial_b U + \frac{n-2}{2}U\Big)(\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\partial_l\phi_i)dy \\
&\geq \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k U\partial_l\phi_i dy + \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n y_b\partial_b\partial_k U\partial_l\phi_i dy \\
&\quad + \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k U\partial_l\phi_i dy - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}\,. \qquad (5.8)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, the term $C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}$ comes from the integrals over $\partial^+B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$ using the estimate (5.2). Another integration by parts gives

$$\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n y_b (\partial_b\partial_k\phi_i)\partial_l U dy + \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n y_b (\partial_b\partial_k U)\partial_l \phi_i dy$$

$$\geq -(n+1)\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n \partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}$$

This, together with the inequalities (5.7) and (5.8), gives

$$-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \left(y^b\partial_b\phi_i + \frac{n-2}{2}\phi_i\right)(\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n\partial_k\partial_l U)dy$$

$$-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \left(y^b\partial_b U + \frac{n-2}{2}U\right)(\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n\partial_k\partial_l \phi_i)dy$$

$$\geq -\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n \partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}\,.$$

The result now follows from the following Claim:

Claim $-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n \partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy \geq -C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}$

Integrating by parts,

$$-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n \partial_k\phi_i\partial_l U dy \geq \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \phi_i\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0) y_n \partial_k\partial_l U - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}$$

$$= -\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} (\Delta\phi_i)\phi_i dy - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}\,.$$

It follows from the estimate (5.2) and the assumption over the dimension that

$$-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} (\Delta\phi_i)\phi_i dy \geq -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (\Delta\phi_i)\phi_i dy - C|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}\delta^{2-n}\,.$$

Hence, in order to prove the Claim, we will show that

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (\Delta\phi_i)\phi_i dy \geq 0 \tag{5.9}$$

Set $\bar{\phi}_i = U^{-1}\phi_i$. Then

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} (\Delta\phi_i)\phi_i dy = -\int_{B^n} (\Delta_{B^n}\bar{\phi}_i)\bar{\phi}_i dz\,, \tag{5.10}$$

where we have used the property (2.7) of the conformal Laplacian. Now, integrating by parts in B^n, we obtain

$$-\int_{B^n}(\Delta_{B^n}\bar{\phi}_i)\bar{\phi}_i dz = \int_{B^n}|\nabla\bar{\phi}_i|^2_{B^n}dz - 2\int_{\partial B^n}\bar{\phi}_i^2 d\sigma\,, \tag{5.11}$$

where η points inwards on ∂B^n. The last equality is due to the equations (5.1) and the property (2.8) of the boundary operator B_g.

By Lemma 2.2,

$$\inf_{\bar{\phi}\in C_1}\frac{\int_{B^n}|\nabla\bar{\phi}|^2 dz}{\int_{\partial B^n}\bar{\phi}^2 d\sigma} = 2\,,$$

where $C_1 = \{\bar{\phi}\in H^1(B^n);\, \int_{\partial B^n}\bar{\phi}d\sigma = 0\}$. Hence, by the identity (5.4),

$$\int_{B^n}|\nabla\bar{\phi}_i|^2_{B^n}dz - 2\int_{\partial B^n}\bar{\phi}_i^2 d\sigma \geq 0\,. \tag{5.12}$$

Now inequality (5.9) follows from equalities (5.10) and (5.11) and inequality (5.12). This proves the Claim. □

6 Blow-up estimates

In this section, we will give a pointwise estimate for a blow-up sequence $\{u_i\}$ in a neighborhood of an isolated simple blow-up point. The arguments given here are modifications of the ones given in [26] and [32] for the case of manifolds without boundary.

Assumption In this section we assume $n \geq 5$.

Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated simple blow-up point for the sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$. Set $v_i(y) = \epsilon_i^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}u_i(\epsilon_i y)$ for $y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}} = B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}(0)$. We know that v_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_{\hat{g}_i}v_i = 0, & \text{in } B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}, \\ B_{\hat{g}_i}v_i + (n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}v_i^{p_i} = 0, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

where $\hat{f}(y) = f(\epsilon_i y)$ and $\hat{g}_i$ is the metric with coefficients $(\hat{g}_i)_{kl}(y) = (g_i)_{kl}(\epsilon_i y)$. Let ϕ_i be the solution to the linearized equation obtained in Proposition 5.1.

The main result of this section is

Proposition 6.1. *There exist $C, \delta > 0$ such that, after passing to conformal Fermi coordinates,*

$$\begin{aligned} |v_i - (U+\phi_i)|(y) &\leq C(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1+|y|)^{4-n} + C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{-1}\,, \\ |\nabla v_i - \nabla(U+\phi_i)|(y) &\leq C(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1+|y|)^{3-n} + C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{-2}\,, \\ |\nabla^2 v_i - \nabla^2(U+\phi_i)|(y) &\leq C(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1+|y|)^{2-n} + C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{-3}\,, \end{aligned}$$

for $y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$.

In order to prove Proposition 6.1 we will first prove some auxiliary results.

Lemma 6.1. *There exist* $\delta, C > 0$ *such that*

$$|v_i - U - \phi_i|(y) \le C \max\{(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2, \epsilon_i^{n-3}, \tau_i\},$$

for $y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$.

Proof. Set

$$\Lambda_i = \max_{y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |v_i - U - \phi_i|(y) = |v_i - U - \phi_i|(y_i),$$

for some $y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$. From Remark 4.5 we know that $v_i \le CU$ in $B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$. Hence, if there is $c > 0$ such that $|y_i| \ge c\epsilon_i^{-1}$, then

$$\Lambda_i = |v_i - U - \phi_i|(y_i) \le C\,|y_i|^{2-n} \le C\,\epsilon_i^{n-2}$$

where we used the estimate (5.2) in the first inequality. This implies the inequality $|v_i - U - \phi_i|(y) \le C\,\epsilon_i^{n-2}$, for $|y| \le \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}$. Hence, we can suppose that $|y_i| \le \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}/2$.

Suppose, by contradiction, the result is false. Then, choosing a subsequence if necessary, we can suppose

$$\Lambda_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2 \to 0, \;\; \Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3}, \;\; \Lambda_i^{-1}\tau_i \to 0\,. \tag{6.2}$$

Define

$$w_i(y) = \Lambda_i^{-1}(v_i - U - \phi_i)(y), \quad \text{for } y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}\,.$$

By the equations (2.1) and (6.1), w_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L_{\hat{g}_i} w_i = Q_i\,, & \text{in } B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}\,, \\ B_{\hat{g}_i} w_i + b_i w_i = \overline{Q}_i\,, & \text{on } \partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}\,, \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

where

$b_i = (n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}\frac{v_i^{p_i} - (U+\phi_i)^{p_i}}{v_i - (U+\phi_i)}$,
$Q_i = -\Lambda_i^{-1}\left\{(L_{\hat{g}_i} - \Delta)(U + \phi_i) + \Delta\phi_i\right\}$,
$\overline{Q}_i = -\Lambda_i^{-1}\left\{(n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(U+\phi_i)^{p_i} - (n-2)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\phi_i - \frac{n-2}{2}h_{\hat{g}_i}(U+\phi_i)\right\}$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}(L_{\hat{g}_i} - \Delta)(y) &= (\hat{g}_i^{kl} - \delta^{kl})(y)\partial_k\partial_l + (\partial_k \hat{g}_i^{kl})(y)\partial_l \\ &\qquad - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_{\hat{g}_i}(y) + \frac{\partial_k\sqrt{\det \hat{g}_i}}{\sqrt{\det \hat{g}_i}}\hat{g}_i^{kl}\partial_l \\ &= (g_i^{kl} - \delta^{kl})(\epsilon_i y)\partial_k\partial_l + \epsilon_i(\partial_k g_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y)\partial_l \\ &\qquad - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}\epsilon_i^2 R_{g_i}(\epsilon_i y) + O(\epsilon_i^N |y|^{N-1})\partial_l\,,\end{aligned}$$

where N can be taken arbitrarily large since we are using conformal Fermi coordinates. Hence, setting $N = n - 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i(y) = &-\Lambda_i^{-1}\{(g_i^{kl} - \delta^{kl})(\epsilon_i y)\partial_k\partial_l(U + \phi_i) + \epsilon_i(\partial_k g_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y)\partial_l(U + \phi_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}\epsilon_i^2 R_{g_i}(\epsilon_i y)(U + \phi_i) + \Delta\phi_i(y)\} + O(\Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3}|y|^{n-4}(1 + |y|)^{1-n}) \\ = &\, O\left(\Lambda_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1 + |y|)^{2-n}\right) + O(\Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1 + |y|)^{-3}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where we have used the identities (5.1) and (5.2) and Proposition 2.1.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &(n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(U + \phi_i)^{p_i} - (n-2)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\phi_i \\ &\quad = (n-2)\left(\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(U + \phi_i)^{p_i} - (U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right) + O(U^{\frac{4-n}{n-2}}\phi_i^2) \\ &\quad = (n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}\left((U + \phi_i)^{p_i} - (U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right) \\ &\qquad + (n-2)(\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i} - 1)(U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} + O(U^{\frac{4-n}{n-2}}\phi_i^2). \end{aligned}$$

Using

$U^{\frac{4-n}{n-2}}\phi_i^2 = O(\epsilon_i^2|h_{kl}(0)|^2(1 + |y|)^{2-n})$,
$h_{\hat{g}_i}(y)(U + \phi_i)(y) = O(\epsilon_i^2|\partial^2 g_i|(1 + |y|)^{3-n})$,
$\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}\left((U + \phi_i)^{p_i} - (U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\right) = O(\tau_i(U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\log(U + \phi_i)) = O(\tau_i(1 + |y|)^{1-n})$,
$(\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i} - 1)(U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} = O(\tau_i\log(f_i)(U + \phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}) = O(\tau_i(1 + |y|)^{-n})$,

where in the second line we used Proposition 2.2, we obtain

$$\bar{Q}_i(\bar{y}) = O\left(\Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^2(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)(1 + |\bar{y}|)^{3-n}\right) + O\left(\Lambda_i^{-1}\tau_i(1 + |\bar{y}|)^{1-n}\right). \tag{6.5}$$

Moreover,

$$b_i(y) \to nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}, \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{6.6}$$

and

$$b_i(y) \le C(1 + |y|)^{-2}, \quad \text{for } |y| \le \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}. \tag{6.7}$$

The estimate (6.7) follows from Remark 4.5.

Since $|w_i| \le |w_i(y_i)| = 1$, we can use standard elliptic estimates to conclude that $w_i \to w$, in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$, for some $w \in C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$, choosing a subsequence if necessary. From the identities (6.2), (6.4), (6.5) and (6.6), w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w = 0, & \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial y_n} + nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}w = 0, & \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{6.8}$$

Claim $w(y) = O((1 + |y|)^{-1})$, for $y \in B^+_{\frac{1}{2}\delta\epsilon_i}$.

Choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough, we can consider the Green's function G_i for the conformal Laplacian $L_{\hat{g}_i}$ in $B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$ subject to the boundary conditions $B_{\hat{g}_i}G_i = 0$, on $\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$, and $G_i = 0$, on $\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$, where η_i is the unit normal to $\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$ pointing inwards. Then the Green's formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} w_i(y) = &- \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} G_i(x,y) Q_i(x)\, dv_{\hat{g}_i}(x) + \int_{\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \frac{\partial G_i}{\partial \eta_i}(x,y) w_i(x)\, d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}(x) \\ &+ \int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} G_i(x,y) \Big(b_i(x) w_i(x) - \overline{Q}_i(x) \Big)\, d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}(x)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Using the estimates (6.4), (6.5) and (6.7) in the equation (6.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |w_i(y)| \leq\, & C\Lambda_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2 \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |\xi - y|^{2-n}(1+|\xi|)^{2-n} d\xi \\ &+ C\Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3} \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |\xi - y|^{2-n}(1+|\xi|)^{-3} d\xi + C \int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |\bar{\xi} - y|^{2-n}(1+|\bar{\xi}|)^{-2} d\bar{\xi} \\ &+ C\Lambda_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2 \int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |\bar{\xi} - y|^{2-n}(1+|\bar{\xi}|)^{3-n} d\bar{\xi} \\ &+ C\Lambda_i^{-1}\tau_i \int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |\bar{\xi} - y|^{2-n}(1+|\bar{\xi}|)^{1-n} d\bar{\xi} + C\Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-2} \int_{\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} |\theta - y|^{1-n} d\theta\,, \end{aligned}$$

for $|y| \leq \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}/2$. Here, we have used the fact that $|G_i(x,y)| \leq C|x-y|^{2-n}$ for $|y| \leq \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}/2$ and, since $v_i(y) \leq CU(y)$, $|w_i(y)| \leq C\Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-2}$ for $|y| = \delta\epsilon_i^{-1}$. Hence, using Lemma 9.2,

$$w_i(y) \leq C\left((1+|y|)^{-1} + \Lambda_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2 + \Lambda_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3} + \Lambda_i^{-1}\tau_i \right).$$

Now the Claim follows from the hypothesis (6.2).

Now, we can use the claim above and Lemma 2.1 to see that

$$w(y) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_j \frac{\partial U}{\partial y_j}(y) + c_n \left(\frac{n-2}{2} U(y) + y^b \partial_b U(y) \right),$$

for some constants $c_1, ..., c_n$. It follow from the identity (5.3) that $w_i(0) = \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial y_j}(0) = 0$ for $j = 1, ..., n-1$. Thus we conclude that $c_1 = ... = c_n = 0$. Hence, $w \equiv 0$. Since $w_i(y_i) = 1$, we have $|y_i| \to \infty$. This contradicts the claim above and concludes the proof of Lemma 6.1. □

Lemma 6.2. *There exists* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\tau_i \leq C \max\{(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2, \epsilon_i^{n-3}\}\,.$$

Proof. Suppose, by contradiction, the result is false. Then we can suppose that

$$\tau_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2,\ \ \tau_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3} \to 0 \tag{6.10}$$

and, by Lemma 6.1, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|v_i - (U + \phi_i)|(y) \le C\tau_i\,,$$

for $y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$. Define

$$w_i(y) = \tau_i^{-1}(v_i - (U + \phi_i))(y)\,, \quad \text{for } y \in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}\,.$$

Then w_i satisfies the equations (6.3) with

$$\begin{aligned}
&b_i = (n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}\tfrac{v_i^{p_i} - (U+\phi_i)^{p_i}}{v_i - (U+\phi_i)}\,,\\
&Q_i = -\tau_i^{-1}\left\{(L_{\hat{g}_i} - \Delta)(U + \phi_i) + \Delta\phi_i\right\},\\
&\overline{Q}_i = -\tau_i^{-1}\left\{(n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(U + \phi_i)^{p_i} - (n-2)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\phi_i - \tfrac{n-2}{2}h_{\hat{g}_i}(U + \phi_i)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the estimates (6.4) and (6.5) we have

$$|Q_i(y)| \le C\tau_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1 + |y|)^{2-n} + C\tau_i^{-1}\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1 + |y|)^{-3}\,, \tag{6.11}$$

$$|\overline{Q}_i(y)| \le C\tau_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1 + |y|)^{3-n} + C(1 + |y|)^{1-n} \tag{6.12}$$

and b_i satisfies the estimate (6.7).

By definition, $w_i \le C$ and, by elliptic standard estimates, we can suppose that $w_i \to w$, in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$ for some $w \in C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$. By the identity (6.6) and the estimates (6.11) and (6.12) we see that w satisfies the equations (6.8). Recall that $\psi_n(y) = \frac{n-2}{2}U(y) + x^b\partial_b U(y)$ also satisfies the equations (6.8) (see Section 2.2).

Let η_i be the inward unit normal vector to $\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$. Using the Green's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \psi_n(B_{\hat{g}_i}w_i + b_i w_i)\,d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i} &= \int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} (B_{\hat{g}_i}\psi_n + b_i\psi_n)w_i\,d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}\\
&\quad + \int_{\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \left(\frac{\partial\psi_n}{\partial\eta_i}w_i - \psi_n\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial\eta_i}\right)d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}\\
&\quad + \int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \Big(w_i(L_{\hat{g}_i}\psi_n) - \psi_n(L_{\hat{g}_i}w_i)\Big)\,dv_{\hat{g}_i}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

It follows from the estimate (5.2) and the hypothesis (6.10) that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \left(\frac{\partial\psi_n}{\partial\eta_i}w_i - \psi_n\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial\eta_i}\right)d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i} = 0\,. \tag{6.14}$$

Using the equations (6.3), the estimate (6.11) and again the hypothesis (6.10), we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\psi_n(L_{\hat{g}_i}w_i)\,dv_{\hat{g}_i} = \lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\psi_n Q_i\,dv_{\hat{g}_i} = 0\,. \tag{6.15}$$

We will now derive a contradiction. First observe that

$$\psi_n(y) = \frac{n-2}{2}\frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{n}{2}}}\,, \quad \text{for } y_n = 0\,. \tag{6.16}$$

Here, $r^2 = y_1^2 + ... + y_{n-1}^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\psi_n U^{\frac{n}{n-2}} &= \frac{n-2}{2}\sigma_{n-2}\int_0^\infty \frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^n}r^{n-2}dr\\ &= \frac{n-2}{2}\sigma_{n-2}\left(\int_0^1 \frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^n}r^{n-2}dr + \int_1^\infty \frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^n}r^{n-2}dr\right) = 0\,,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we change variables $s = r^{-1}$. Now, observe that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\tau_i^{-1}\left(\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(y)U^{p_i}(y) - U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(y)\right) = -\left(\log f(0) + \log U(y)\right)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(y)\,,$$

and, similarly to the estimate (6.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\overline{Q}_i(y) - (n-2)\tau_i^{-1}\left(\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(y)(U+\phi_i)^{p_i}(y) - (U+\phi_i)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(y)\right)\right|\\ &\qquad\le C\tau_i^{-1}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2(1+|y|)^{3-n}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\psi_n U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\,d\sigma = 0$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\psi_n\bar{Q}_i\,d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i} = -(n-2)\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\psi_n\log(U)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\,d\sigma\,, \tag{6.17}$$

where we have used the hypothesis (6.10).

Claim $\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\psi_n\log(U)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\,d\sigma > 0$.

By the identity (6.16),

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+}\psi_n(\log U)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}\,d\sigma = -\frac{(n-2)^2}{4}\sigma_{n-2}\int_0^\infty\frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^n}\log(1+r^2)r^{n-2}dr\,.$$

Changing variables $s = r^{-1}$, we get

$$\int_0^\infty\frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^n}\log(1+r^2)r^{n-2}dr = 2\int_1^\infty\frac{1-r^2}{(1+r^2)^n}\log(r)r^{n-2}dr < 0\,,$$

which concludes the proof of the Claim.

On the other hand, the equation (6.13) together with the equations (6.3), (6.8), (6.14) and (6.15) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\psi_n\bar{Q}_i\,d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i} &= \lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} w_i(B_{\hat{g}_i}\psi_n+b_i\psi_n)\,d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}+\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}} w_i(L_{\hat{g}_i}\psi_n)\,dv_{\hat{g}_i}\\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+} w\left(\frac{\partial\psi_n}{\partial y_n}+nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\psi_n\right)d\sigma+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_+} w\Delta\psi_n\,dx=0\,. \quad (6.18)\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the fact that, by the identity (6.17), this limit should be independent of $\delta>0$ arbitrarily small. By the previous claim, this contradicts the identity (6.17). □

Proposition 6.2. *There exist $C,\delta>0$ such that*

$$|v_i-(U+\phi_i)|(y)\le C\max\{(|\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^2,\epsilon_i^{n-3}\}\,,$$

for $y\in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$.

Proof. This result follows from Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2. □

Now, we are able to prove Proposition 6.1.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Define

$$w_i(y)=(v_i-(U+\phi_i))(y)\,,\quad \text{for } y\in B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}\,.$$

Then w_i is uniformly bounded in compacts (by Proposition 6.2) and satisfies the equations (6.3) with

$$\begin{aligned}&b_i=(n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}\tfrac{v_i^{p_i}-(U+\phi_i)^{p_i}}{v_i-(U+\phi_i)},\\ &Q_i=-\Big\{(L_{\hat{g}_i}-\Delta)(U+\phi_i)+\Delta\phi_i\Big\},\\ &\overline{Q}_i=-\Big\{(n-2)\hat{f}_i^{-\tau_i}(U+\phi_i)^{p_i}-(n-2)U^{\frac{n}{n-2}}-nU^{\frac{2}{n-2}}\phi_i-\tfrac{n-2}{2}h_{\hat{g}_i}(U+\phi_i)\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that b_i satisfies the estimate (6.7). Similarly to the estimates (6.4), (6.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}|Q_i(y)|&\le C\epsilon_i^2(|\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^2)(1+|y|)^{2-n}+C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{-3}\,, && (6.19)\\ |\overline{Q}_i(y)|&\le C\epsilon_i^2(|\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^2)(1+|y|)^{3-n}+C\tau_i(1+|y|)^{1-n}\\ &\le C\epsilon_i^2(|\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^2)(1+|y|)^{3-n}+C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{1-n}\,, && (6.20)\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Lemma 6.2.

The Green's formula gives

$$\begin{aligned}w_i(y)=&-\int_{B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}G_i(x,y)Q_i(x)\,dv_{\hat{g}_i}(x)+\int_{\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\frac{\partial G_i}{\partial\eta_i}(x,y)w_i(x)\,d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}(x)\\ &+\int_{\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}}G_i(x,y)\left(b_i(x)w_i(x)-\overline{Q}_i(x)\right)d\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}(x)\,. \quad (6.21)\end{aligned}$$

where η_i is the inward unit normal vector to $\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$ and G_i is the Green's function G_i for the conformal Laplacian $L_{\hat{g}_i}$ in $B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$ subject to the boundary conditions $B_{\hat{g}_i}G_i = 0$, on $\partial' B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$, and $G_i = 0$, on $\partial^+ B^+_{\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$. Using the estimates (6.7), (6.19), (6.20), Lemma 6.2 and Proposition 6.2 in equation (6.21), as in the proof of Lemma 6.1 we obtain

$$|w_i(y)| \leq C\epsilon_i^2(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)(1+|y|)^{-1} + C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{-1}\,, \tag{6.22}$$

for $y \in B^+_{\frac{1}{2}\delta\epsilon_i^{-1}}$. If $n=5$, we have the result. If $n \geq 6$, we plug the inequality (6.22) in the Green's formula (6.21) until we reach

$$|w_i(y)| \leq C\epsilon_i^2(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)(1+|y|)^{4-n} + C\epsilon_i^{n-3}(1+|y|)^{-1}\,.$$

The derivative estimates follow from elliptic theory, finishing the proof. ☐

7 Local blow-up analysis

In this section we will prove the vanishing of the trace-free second fundamental form in an isolated simple blow-up point if $n \geq 7$. We will also prove a Pohozaev sign condition that will be used later in the study of the blow-up set. The basic tool here will be the Pohozaev-type the identity of Section 3 and the blow-up estimates of Section 6.

7.1 Vanishing of the trace-free 2nd fundamental form

The vanishing of π_{kl}, the trace-free 2nd fundamental form of the boundary, in an isolated simple blow-up point is stated as follows:

Theorem 7.1. *Suppose that $n \geq 7$. Let $x_i \to x_0$ be an isolated simple blow-up point for the sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$. Then*

$$|\pi_{kl}(x_i)|^2 \leq C\epsilon_i\,.$$

In particular, $\pi_{kl}(x_0) = 0$.

Proof. In what follows we are using conformal Fermi coordinates centered at x_i. By Proposition 2.2 (iii), we can suppose that $h(0) = h_{,k}(0) = 0$. In particular, $\pi_{kl}(0) = h_{kl}(0)$. Recall that we use indices $1 \leq k,l \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq a,b \leq n$ when working with coordinates. In many parts of the proof we will use the identity (5.5).

We write the Pohozaev identity of Proposition 3.1 as

$$P(u_i,r) = F_i(u_i,r) + \bar{F}_i(u_i,r) + \frac{\tau_i}{p_i+1}Q_i(u_i,r)\,, \tag{7.1}$$

where
$F_i(u,r) = -\int_{B_r^+}(x^b\partial_b u + \frac{n-2}{2}u)(L_{g_i} - \Delta)u\,dx,$

$\bar{F}_i(u,r) = \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{\partial' B_r^+}(\bar{x}^b\partial_b u + \frac{n-2}{2}u)h_{g_i}u\,d\bar{x}$,
$Q_i(u,r) = \frac{(n-2)^2}{2}\int_{\partial' B_r^+} f_i^{-\tau_i}u^{p_i+1}d\bar{x} - (n-2)\int_{\partial' B_r^+}(x^k\partial_k f)f_i^{-\tau_i-1}u^{p_i+1}d\bar{x}$.

Fix $r > 0$ small enough such that $Q_i(u_i, r) \geq 0$. For the term $\bar{F}_i$ we have,

$$\bar{F}_i(u_i,r) = \frac{n-2}{2}\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{(p_i-1)}+n-2}\int_{\partial' B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\left(\bar{y}^b\partial_b v_i + \frac{n-2}{2}v_i\right)\epsilon_i h_{g_i}(\epsilon_i\bar{y})v_i(\bar{y})d\bar{y}\,,$$

Since $h(0) = h_{,k}(0) = 0$ and the fact that, according to Proposition 4.4, $\lim_{i\to\infty}\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{p_i-1}+n-2} = \lim_{i\to\infty}\epsilon_i^{-(n-2)\frac{\tau_i}{p_i-1}} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{F}_i(u_i,r) &= (1+o_i(1))\int_{\partial' B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|\bar{y}|)^{2-n})O(\epsilon_i^3|\partial^3 g_i||\bar{y}|^2)O((1+|\bar{y}|)^{2-n})d\bar{y}\\ &\geq -C\epsilon_i^3|\partial^3 g_i|\int_{\partial' B^+_{rM_i^{p_i-1}}}(1+|\bar{y}|)^{6-2n}d\bar{y}\,. \qquad (7.2)\end{aligned}$$

Set $\tilde{u}_i(x) = \epsilon_i^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}}(U+\phi_i)(\epsilon_i^{-1}x)$. Using the facts that $g_i^{nn} \equiv 1$ and $g_i^{kn} \equiv 0$ in Fermi coordinates, we have

$$\begin{aligned}F_i(u_i,r) &= -\int_{B_r^+}(x^b\partial_b u_i + \frac{n-2}{2}u_i)(L_{g_i}-\Delta)u_i dx\\ &= -\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{(p_i-1)}+n-2}\int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}(y^b\partial_b v_i + \frac{n-2}{2}v_i)(L_{\hat{g}_i}-\Delta)v_i dy\,,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}F_i(\tilde{u}_i,r) &= -\int_{B_r^+}(x^b\partial_b\tilde{u}_i + \frac{n-2}{2}\tilde{u}_i)(L_{g_i}-\Delta)\tilde{u}_i dx\\ &= -\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{(p_i-1)}+n-2}\int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}(y^b\partial_b(U+\phi_i) + \frac{n-2}{2}(U+\phi_i))(L_{\hat{g}_i}-\Delta)(U+\phi_i)dy\,.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Proposition 6.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}|F_i(u_i,r) - F_i(\tilde{u}_i,r)| &\leq C\epsilon_i^3(|\partial g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i|)(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}(1+|y|)^{5-2n}dy\\ &\quad + C\epsilon_i^{n-2}(|\partial g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i|)\int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}(1+|y|)^{-n}dy\,. \qquad (7.3)\end{aligned}$$

We write

$$F_i(\tilde{u}_i,r) = (1+o_i(1))\left\{R_i(U,U) + R_i(U,\phi_i) + R_i(\phi_i,U) + R_i(\phi_i,\phi_i)\right\}\,, \qquad (7.4)$$

where we have defined

$$R_i(w_1,w_2)=-\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}(y^b\partial_b w_1+\frac{n-2}{2}w_1)(L_{\hat{g}_i}-\Delta)w_2dy\,.$$

Using the identities (7.2), (7.3) and (7.4) and the fact that $Q_i(u_i,r)\geq 0$ in the equality (7.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}P(u_i,r)\geq(1+o_i(1))\left\{R_i(U,U)+R_i(U,\phi_i)+R_i(\phi_i,U)+R_i(\phi_i,\phi_i)\right\}\\ -C(|\partial g_i||\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^3+|\partial^2 g_i|^2+|\partial^3 g_i|)\,\epsilon_i^3\\ -C(|\partial g_i|+|\partial^2 g_i|)\,\epsilon_i^{n-2}(\log\epsilon_i)(\log r)\,.\end{aligned}\tag{7.5}$$

By Proposition 2.1 and the estimate (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned}R_i(U,\phi_i)+R_i(\phi_i,U)&=-\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\left(y^b\partial_b\phi_i+\frac{n-2}{2}\phi_i\right)(L_{\hat{g}_i}-\Delta)Udy\\ &\quad-\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\left(y^b\partial_b U+\frac{n-2}{2}U\right)(L_{\hat{g}_i}-\Delta)\phi_i dy\\ &\geq-\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\left(y^b\partial_b\phi_i+\frac{n-2}{2}\phi_i\right)(2\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\partial_l U)dy\\ &\quad-\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}\left(y^b\partial_b U+\frac{n-2}{2}U\right)(2\epsilon_i h_{kl}(0)y_n\partial_k\partial_l\phi_i)dy\\ &\quad-C\epsilon_i^3|h_{kl}(0)|(|\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^2)\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}(1+|y|)^{5-2n}dy\,.\end{aligned}$$

Now we apply Proposition 5.2 to this inequality to ensure that

$$R_i(U,\phi_i)+R_i(\phi_i,U)\geq-C\left(\epsilon_i^3|h_{kl}(0)|(|\partial^2 g_i|+|\partial g_i|^2)+|h_{kl}(0)|^2\epsilon_i^{n-2}r^{2-n}\right)\,.\tag{7.6}$$

It follows from the estimate (5.2) that

$$R_i(\phi_i,\phi_i)=\epsilon_i^3|h_{kl}(0)|^2|\partial g_i|\int_{B_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}}O((1+|y|)^{5-2n})dy\,.\tag{7.7}$$

We will now handle the term $R_i(U,U)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_l U(y)&=-(n-2)\left((1+y_n)^2+|\bar{y}|^2\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}}y_l\,,\\ \partial_k\partial_l U(y)&=(n-2)\left((1+y_n)^2+|\bar{y}|^2\right)^{-\frac{n+2}{2}}\left(ny_ky_l-((1+y_n)^2+|\bar{y}|^2)\delta_{kl}\right)\,,\\ y^b\partial_b U+\frac{n-2}{2}U&=-\frac{n-2}{2}\left((1+y_n)^2+|\bar{y}|^2\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}}(|y|^2-1)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Using this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(U,U) = {} & \frac{(n-2)^2}{2} \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \frac{|y|^2-1}{((1+y_n)^2+|y|^2)^{n+1}} \\ & \qquad \cdot (g_i^{kl}-\delta^{kl})(\epsilon_i y)\left(n y_k y_l - ((1+y_n)^2+|\bar{y}|^2)\delta_{kl}\right) dy \\ & - \frac{(n-2)^2}{2} \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \frac{|y|^2-1}{((1+y_n)^2+|y|^2)^{n}} \cdot \epsilon_i (\partial_k g^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) y_l dy \\ & - \frac{(n-2)^2}{8(n-1)} \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} \frac{|y|^2-1}{((1+y_n)^2+|y|^2)^{n-1}} \cdot \epsilon_i^2 R_{g_i}(\epsilon_i y) dy\,. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 2.1 and symmetry arguments, we have

$$R_i(U,U) \geq \frac{(n-2)^2}{2}(A_1+A_2+A_3+A_4) - C(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\epsilon_i^{n-2} r^{2-n}\,,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= n \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty}\int_{s=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n+1}} \left\{ \int_{S_s^{n-2}} (g_i^{kl}-\delta_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) y_k y_l \, d\sigma_s(y) \right\} ds dy_n, \\ A_2 &= -\int_{y_n=0}^{\infty}\int_{s=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n}} \left\{ \int_{S_s^{n-2}} (g_i^{kl}-\delta_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) \delta_{kl} \, d\sigma_s(y) \right\} ds dy_n, \\ A_3 &= -\int_{y_n=0}^{\infty}\int_{s=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n}} \left\{ \epsilon_i \int_{S_s^{n-2}} (\partial_k g_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) y_l \, d\sigma_s(y) \right\} ds dy_n, \\ A_4 &= \tfrac{-1}{4(n-1)} \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty}\int_{s=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n-1}} \left\{ \epsilon_i^2 \int_{S_s^{n-2}} R_{g_i}(\epsilon_i y) \, d\sigma_s(y) \right\} ds dy_n. \end{aligned}$$

Using Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_s^{n-2}} (g_i^{kl}-\delta_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) y_k y_l \, d\sigma_s &= \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 \frac{y_n^2 s^n}{n-1} \cdot 2|h_{kl}(0)|^2 + \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| O(|(s,y_n)|^{n+3})\,, \\ \int_{S_s^{n-2}} (g_i^{kl}-\delta_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) \delta_{kl} \, d\sigma_s &= \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 \cdot y_n^2 s^{n-2} \cdot 2|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \\ & \qquad + \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| O(|(s,y_n)|^{n+1})\,, \\ \epsilon_i \cdot \int_{S_s^{n-2}} (\partial_k g_i^{kl})(\epsilon_i y) y_l \, d\sigma_s &= \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| O(|(s,y_n)|^{n+1})\,, \\ \epsilon_i^2 \cdot \int_{S_s^{n-2}} R_{g_i}(\epsilon_i y) \, d\sigma_s &= -\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 \cdot s^{n-2} \cdot |h_{kl}(0)|^2 \\ & \qquad + \epsilon_i^3 (|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i||\partial g_i|) O(|(s,y_n)|^{n-1})\,, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the fact that, by the Gauss equation, $R(0) + |h_{kl}(0)|^2 = 0$. Set $I = \int_0^\infty \frac{s^n}{(s^2+1)^n} ds$. Using Corollary 9.1 and the four equalities above,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 \cdot \frac{2n}{n-1}|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} y_n^2 \left\{ \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n+1}} s^n ds \right\} dy_n \\
&\qquad + \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \\
&= \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I \cdot \frac{n+1}{n-1}|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} y_n^2 (y_n+1)^{1-n} dy_n \\
&\quad + \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I \cdot |h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} y_n^2 (y_n^2-1)(y_n+1)^{-1-n} dy_n \\
&\qquad + \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \,,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2 &= -\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 \cdot 2|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} y_n^2 \left\{ \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n}} s^{n-2} ds \right\} dy_n \\
&\qquad + \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \\
&= -\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I \cdot 2|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} y_n^2 (y_n+1)^{1-n} dy_n \\
&\quad - \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I \cdot 2|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} y_n^2 (y_n^2-1)(y_n+1)^{-1-n} dy_n \\
&\qquad + \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \,,
\end{aligned}$$

$$A_3 = \epsilon_i^3 |\partial^3 g_i| \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \,,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_4 &= \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 \cdot \frac{1}{4(n-1)}|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^2+y_n^2-1}{(s^2+(y_n+1)^2)^{n-1}} s^{n-2} ds \right\} dy_n \\
&\qquad + \epsilon_i^3 (|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i||\partial g_i|) \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \\
&= \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I \cdot \frac{1}{2(n-3)}|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} (y_n+1)^{3-n} dy_n \\
&\quad + \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I \cdot \frac{1}{2(n-1)}|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \int_{y_n=0}^{\infty} (y_n^2-1)(y_n+1)^{1-n} dy_n \\
&\qquad + \epsilon_i^3 (|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i||\partial g_i|) \int_{B^+_{r\epsilon_i^{-1}}} O((1+|y|)^{5-2n}) dy \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $J_k = \int_0^\infty \frac{y_n^k}{(1+y_n)^n} dy_n$. It follows from the above computations that

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(U,U) \geq{}& -C\epsilon_i^3(|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i||\partial g_i|) - C\epsilon_i^{n-2} r^{2-n}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\\ &+\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I\cdot\left\{\frac{n+1}{n-1}(J_3+J_2)+(J_3-J_2)-2(J_3+J_2)-2(J_3-J_2)\right\}|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \\ &+\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I\cdot\left\{\frac{1}{2(n-3)}(J_3+3J_2+3J_1+J_0)+\frac{1}{2(n-1)}(J_3+J_2-J_1-J_0)\right\}|h_{kl}(0)|^2\\ ={}& \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2 I\cdot(\alpha_3J_3+\alpha_2J_2+\alpha_1J_1+\alpha_0J_0)\cdot|h_{kl}(0)|^2\\ &\quad - C\epsilon_i^3(|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i||\partial g_i|) - C\epsilon_i^{n-2} r^{2-n}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

where $\alpha_3 = -2 + \frac{1}{2(n-3)} + \frac{5}{2(n-1)}$, $\alpha_2 = \frac{3}{2(n-3)} + \frac{5}{2(n-1)}$, $\alpha_1 = \frac{3}{2(n-3)} - \frac{1}{2(n-1)}$ and $\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2(n-3)} - \frac{1}{2(n-1)}$.

By Lemma 9.5, $J_2 = \frac{n-4}{3}J_3$, $J_1 = \frac{(n-4)(n-3)}{6}J_3$ and $J_0 = \frac{(n-4)(n-3)(n-2)}{6}J_3$. Then a directy computation shows that

$$\alpha_0J_0+\alpha_1J_1+\alpha_2J_2+\alpha_3J_3 = \frac{n-6}{3}J_3\,.$$

This, together with the inequality (7.8), implies

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(U,U) \geq{}& \sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2\frac{n-6}{3}IJ_3|h_{kl}(0)|^2 - C\epsilon_i^{n-2}r^{2-n}(|\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial g_i|^2)\\ &- C\epsilon_i^3(|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i||\partial g_i|)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

Hence, by the estimates (7.5), (7.6), (7.7) and (7.9),

$$\begin{aligned} P(u_i,r) \geq{}& (1+o_i(1))\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2\frac{n-6}{3}IJ_3|h_{kl}(0)|^2 - C\epsilon_i^{n-2}(\log\epsilon_i)r^{2-n}(|\partial g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i|)\\ &- C\epsilon_i^3(|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial g_i||\partial^2 g_i| + |\partial^2 g_i|^2 + |\partial g_i|^3) \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 4.3 we can assume that $\epsilon_i^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}}u_i$ converges in $C^2_{loc}(M\backslash\{x_0\})$. Hence, for $r>0$ fixed, $\epsilon_i^{-\frac{2}{p_i-1}}P(u_i,r)$ converges and

$$P(u_i,r)\leq C\epsilon_i^{n-2}. \tag{7.11}$$

Then, for $r>0$ small fixed, the estimate (7.10) together with the estimate (7.11) and our dimension assumption gives $|h_{kl}(0)|^2 \leq C\epsilon_i$. This proves Theorem 7.1, since under our assumptions $\pi_{kl}(x_i) = h_{kl}(0)$. □

7.2 Pohozaev sign condition

Now we will state and prove the Pohozaev sign condition.

Set

$$P'(u,r) = \int_{\partial^+B_r^+}\left(\frac{n-2}{2}u\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} - \frac{r}{2}|\nabla u|^2 + r\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right|^2\right)d\sigma_r\,.$$

Theorem 7.2. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be a blow-up point for the sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$. Assume that $\pi_{kl}(x_0) \neq 0$ and $n \geq 7$. We work in $B^+_\delta(0)$ using Fermi coordinates centered at x_i. For $0 < \tau_i \to 0$, set*

$$w_i(y) = \tau_i^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} u_i(\tau_i y)$$

for $y \in B^+_{\delta\tau_i^{-1}}(0)$. Suppose that the origin 0 is an isolated simple blow-up point for the sequence $\{w_i\}$ and that $w_i(0)w_i \to G$ away from the origin, for some function G. Then

$$\lim_{r\to 0} P'(G,r) \geq 0\,.$$

Proof. Observe that $|\pi_{kl}(0)| = |\pi_{kl}(x_i)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\pi_{kl}(x_0)|$ for i large. We will restringe our analysis to $B^+_{\tilde{\delta}}(0) \subset B^+_{\delta\tau_i^{-1}}(0)$, for some $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ fixed. Set $\tilde{\epsilon}_i = \epsilon_i\tau_i^{-1}$. Hence, $w_i(0) = \tilde{\epsilon}_i^{-\frac{1}{p_i-1}}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_i \to 0$. Let $\tilde{g}_i$ be the metric on $B^+_{\tilde{\delta}}(0)$ with coefficients $(\tilde{g}_i)_{kl}(y) = (g_i)_{kl}(\tau_i y)$ and denote by $\tilde{h}_{kl}$ the corresponding 2nd fundamental form.

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 7.1, using conformal Fermi coordinates we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(w_i,r) \geq{}& (1+o_i(1))\sigma_{n-2}\tilde{\epsilon}_i^2\frac{n-6}{3}IJ_3|\tilde{h}_{kl}(0)|^2 - C\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-2}(\log\tilde{\epsilon}_i)r^{2-n}(|\partial\tilde{g}_i| + |\partial^2\tilde{g}_i|)\\ &- C\tilde{\epsilon}_i^3(|\partial^3\tilde{g}_i| + |\partial\tilde{g}_i||\partial^2\tilde{g}_i| + |\partial^2\tilde{g}_i|^2 + |\partial\tilde{g}_i|^3)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

By the Young's inequality,

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-2}(\log\tilde{\epsilon}_i)r^{2-n}|\partial\tilde{g}_i| \leq |\partial\tilde{g}_i|^2\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-2}(\log\tilde{\epsilon}_i)^2r^{2-2n} + \tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-2}r^2\,.$$

Hence, writing the inequality (7.12) in terms of the metric g_i we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(w_i,r) \geq{}& (1+o_i(1))\sigma_{n-2}\epsilon_i^2\frac{n-6}{3}IJ_3|h_{kl}(0)|^2 - C\epsilon_i^2(|\partial g_i|^2 + |\partial^2 g_i|)\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-4}(\log\tilde{\epsilon}_i)^2r^{2-2n}\\ &- C\epsilon_i^3(|\partial^3 g_i| + |\partial g_i||\partial^2 g_i| + \tau_i|\partial^2 g_i|^2 + |\partial g_i|^3) - C\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-2}r^2\\ \geq{}& -C\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{n-2}r^2\,, \end{aligned}$$

for large i and $r > 0$ small fixed. Here, we used our dimension assumption and the fact that $|\pi_{kl}(0)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\pi_{kl}(x_0)| > 0$ in the last inequality. Hence, Proposition 4.4 implies

$$P'(G,r) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{-\frac{2}{p_i-1}}P(w_i,r) \geq -Cr^2\,.$$

This proves Theorem 7.2. □

8 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.1.

The first proposition of this section states that every isolated blow-up point $x_i \to x_0$ is also simple, as long as π_{kl}, the boundary trace-free 2nd fundamental form, does not vanish at x_0.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $x_i \to x_0$ be a blow-up point for the sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$. Assume that $\pi_{kl}(x_0) \neq 0$ and $n \geq 7$. We work in $B^+_\delta(0)$ using Fermi coordinates centered at x_i. If $0 < \tau_i \to 0$ or $\tau_i = 1$, set*

$$w_i(y) = \tau_i^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} u_i(\tau_i y)$$

for $y \in B^+_{\delta\tau_i^{-1}}(0)$. Suppose that the origin 0 is an isolated blow-up point for the sequence $\{w_i\}$. Then it is also isolated simple.

Proof. Suppose that the origin is an isolated blow-up point for $\{w_i\}$ but is not simple. By definition, passing to a subsequence, there are at least two critical points of $r \mapsto r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\bar{w}_i(r)$ in an interval $(0, \bar{\rho}_i)$, $\bar{\rho}_i \to 0$. Let $r_i = R_i w_i(0)^{-(p_i-1)} \to 0$ and $R_i \to \infty$ as in Proposition 4.1. By Remark 4.3, there is exactly one critical point in the interval $(0, r_i)$. Let ρ_i be the second critical point. Then $\bar{\rho}_i > \rho_i \geq r_i$.

Set $v_i(z) = \rho_i^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} w_i(\rho_i z)$, for $z \in B^+_{\delta\rho_i^{-1}}(0)$. Observe that, since $\rho_i \geq r_i$,

$$v_i(0)^{p_i-1} = \rho_i w_i(0)^{p_i-1} \geq R_i \to \infty\,.$$

Hence, $v_i(0) \to \infty$.

By the scaling invariance (see Remark 4.1), the origin is an isolated blow-up point for $\{v_i\}$. By the definitions, $r \mapsto r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\bar{v}_i(r)$ has exactly one critical point in the interval $(0, 1)$ and

$$\frac{d}{dr}\left(r^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\bar{v}_i(r)\right)\Big|_{r=1} = 0\,. \tag{8.1}$$

Hence, the origin is an isolated simple blow-up point for $\{v_i\}$. It follows from Proposition 4.3 that $v_i(0)v_i$ is uniformly bounded in compacts of $\mathbb{R}^n_+\backslash\{0\}$. Using the equations (2.9) and the scaling invariance property stated in Section 2.4, we can suppose that

$$v_i(0)v_i(z) \to G(z) = a|z|^{2-n} + b(z)\,,$$

in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+\backslash\{0\})$. Here, b is harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ with Neumann condition on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$ and $a > 0$. Since $G > 0$, $\liminf_{|z|\to\infty} b(z) \geq 0$. By the Liouville's theorem, b is constant. By the equality (8.1),

$$\frac{d}{dr}\left(r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}h(r)\right)\Big|_{r=1} = 0\,,$$

which implies that $b = a > 0$. This contradicts the sign condition of Theorem 7.2. □

The next proposition ensures that the set $\{x_1, ..., x_N\} \subset \partial M$ of points obtained in Proposition 4.2 can only contain isolated blow-up points for any blow-up sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$ as long as π_{kl} does not vanish at the blow-up point.

Proposition 8.2. *Assume that $n \geq 7$. Let $\beta > 0$ be small, $R > 0$ be large and consider $C_0 = C_0(\beta, R)$ and $C_1 = C_1(\beta, R)$ as in Proposition 4.2. Let $x_0 \in \partial M$ be a point such that $\pi_{kl}(x_0) \neq 0$. Then there is $\delta > 0$ such that, for any $u \in \mathcal{M}_p$ satisfying $\max_{\partial M} u \geq C_0$, the set $\partial' B^+_\delta(x_0) \cap \{x_1(u), ..., x_N(u)\}$ consists of at most one point. Here, $x_1(u), ..., x_N(u) \in \partial M$, with $N = N(u)$, are the points obtained in Proposition 4.2.*

Proof. Suppose the result is not true. Then there is a sequence $u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i$, $\max_{\partial M} u_i \geq C_0$, such that after relabeling the indices we have $x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)} \to x_0$, as $i \to \infty$. Here, we have set $x_1^{(i)} = x_1(u_i), ..., x_{N_i}^{(i)} = x_{N_i}(u_i)$ and $N_i = N(u_i)$.

Define

$$s_i = d_{\bar{g}}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \to \infty.$$

Claim 1 There exist $1 \leq j_i \neq k_i \leq N_i$ such that $x_{j_i}^{(i)}, x_{k_i}^{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{2s_i^{-1}}(x_1^{(i)})$,

$$\sigma_i := d_{\bar{g}}(x_{j_i}^{(i)}, x_{k_i}^{(i)}) \leq d_{\bar{g}}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}),$$

$$d_{\bar{g}}(x_l^{(i)}, x_m^{(i)}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_i\,, \quad \text{for all } x_l^{(i)}, x_m^{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{s_i\sigma_i}(x_{j_i}^{(i)}),\ l \neq m\,.$$

Suppose that Claim 1 is false. Then there exist $x_{l_1}^{(i)}, x_{m_1}^{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{s_i^{-1}}(x_1^{(i)})$, $l_1 \neq m_1$, with

$$\sigma_{1,i} := d_{\bar{g}}(x_{l_1}^{(i)}, x_{m_1}^{(i)}) < \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{0,i} := \frac{1}{2}s_i^{-2}.$$

If we repeat this procedure, we obtain sequences $x_{l_r}^{(i)}, x_{m_r}^{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{s_i\sigma_{r-1,i}}(x_{l_{r-1}}^{(i)})$, $l_r \neq m_r$, with

$$\sigma_{r,i} = d_{\bar{g}}(x_{l_r}^{(i)}, x_{m_r}^{(i)}) < \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{r-1,i}.$$

Since $N_i < \infty$, this procedure has to stop and we reach a contradiction. This proves Claim 1.

Using Claim 1 and a relabeling of indices, we find $x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)} \to x_0$ and $s_i \to \infty$ so that, if $\sigma_i = d_{\bar{g}}(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)})$, we have $s_i\sigma_i \to 0$ and

$$d_{\bar{g}}(x_l^{(i)}, x_m^{(i)}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_i\,, \quad \text{for all } x_l^{(i)}, x_m^{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{s_i\sigma_i}(x_1^{(i)})\,,\ l \neq m\,.$$

By the item (3) of Proposition 4.2 we have $u_i(x_1^{(i)}), u_i(x_2^{(i)}) \to \infty$.

Now we use Fermi coordinates centered at $x_1^{(i)}$ and set

$$v_i(y) = \sigma_i^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} u_i(\sigma_i y)\,, \quad \text{for } y \in B^+_{s_i}(0)\,.$$

If $x_l^{(i)} \in \partial' B^+_{s_i\sigma_i}(0)$ and we set $y_l^{(i)} = \sigma_i^{-1} x_l^{(i)}$ (in particular, $y_1^{(i)} = 0$), then each $y_l^{(i)}$ is a local maximum of v_i and by the item (3) of Proposition 4.2,

$$\min_{y_l^{(i)}}\{|y - y_l^{(i)}|^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}\} v_i(y) \leq C\,, \quad \text{for } y \in \partial' B^+_{\frac{1}{2}s_i}(0)\,.$$

Furthermore $|y_2^{(i)}| = |y_1^{(i)} - y_2^{(i)}| = 1$ and $\min_{l \neq m} |y_l^{(i)} - y_m^{(i)}| \geq \frac{1}{2} + o_i(1)$.

Claim 2 $v_i(y_1^{(i)}), v_i(y_2^{(i)}) \to \infty$.

If $v_i(y_2^{(i)})$ stays bounded but $v_i(y_1^{(i)}) \to \infty$ then the blow-up at $v_i(y_1^{(i)})$ is isolated and hence isolated simple, while v_i remains uniformly bounded near $y_2^{(i)}$. It follows from Lemma 9.3 and Proposition 4.3 that $v_i(y_2^{(i)}) \to 0$. This is a contradiction since the item (1) of Proposition 4.2 implies that

$$\sigma_i \geq \max\{Ru_i(x_1^{(i)})^{-(p_i-1)}, Ru_i(x_2^{(i)})^{-(p_i-1)}\},$$

thus

$$v_i(y_1^{(i)}), v_i(y_2^{(i)}) \geq R^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}}. \tag{8.2}$$

Of course the same argument holds if we exchange the roles of $v_i(y_1^{(i)})$ and $v_i(y_2^{(i)})$.

On the other hand, if both $v_i(y_1^{(i)})$ and $v_i(y_2^{(i)})$ remain bounded, we can suppose that any other $v_i(y_l^{(i)})$ also does, using the same argument above. Then after passing to a subsequence $v_i \to v > 0$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$, where v satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \eta} + (n-2)v^{p_0} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \end{cases}$$

and $\partial_k v(0) = \partial_k v(y_2) = 0$ for $k = 1, ..., n-1$. Here $p_0 = \lim_{i\to\infty} p_i \in [\frac{n}{n-2} - \beta, \frac{n}{n-2}]$ and $y_2 = \lim_{i\to\infty} y_2^{(i)}$. Note that $|y_2| = 1$. Then the Liouville-type theorems of [25] and [30] yield that $v \equiv 0$, which contradicts the inequalities (8.2). This proves Claim 2.

It follows from Claim 2 that $0 = y_1^{(i)}$ and $y_2^{(i)}$ are isolated blow-up points. Thus Proposition 8.1 implies that they are isolated simple.

Then

$$v_i(y_1^{(i)})v_i(y) \to G(y) := a_1|y|^{2-n} + a_2|y-y_2|^{2-n} + b(y)$$

in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n_+ - S)$, where S denotes the set of blow-up points for $\{v_i\}$, $b(y)$ is a harmonic function on $\mathbb{R}^n_+ - (S - \{0, y_2\})$ with Neumann boundary condition and $a_1, a_2 > 0$. By the maximum principle, $b(y) \geq 0$. Hence, for $|y|$ near 0,

$$G(y) = a_1|y|^{2-n} + b + O(|y|)$$

for some constant $b > 0$. This contradicts the sign condition of Theorem 7.2 and proves Proposition 8.2. □

Now we are able to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose by contradiction that $x_i \to x_0$ is a blow-up point for a sequence $\{u_i \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$ and $\pi_{kl}(x_0) \neq 0$. Let $x_1(u_i), ..., x_{N(u_i)}(u_i)$ be the points obtained in Proposition 4.2. By the item (3) of this Proposition, we must have $d_g(x_i, x_{k_i}(u_i)) \to 0$ for some $1 \leq k_i \leq N(u_i)$. If $x_{k_i} = x_{k_i}(u_i)$, it is not difficult to see that $u_i(x_{k_i}) \to \infty$. Thus $x_{k_i} \to x_0$ is a blow-up point for $\{u_i\}$. It follows from Propositions 8.1 and 8.2 that $x_{k_i} \to x_0$ is isolated simple. This contradicts Theorem 7.1. □

9 Appendix

In this section, we will state some technical results that were used in the previous computations.

Our first result is a modification of Proposition 2.7 in [27]. The proof is similar.

Lemma 9.1. *Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold with boundary ∂M. Let $x \in \partial M$ and $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ be an open set containing x. Let u be a a weak solution to*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0\,, & \text{in } \mathcal{U}\backslash\{x\} \\ (\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} + \psi)u = 0\,, & \text{on } \mathcal{U} \cap \partial M\backslash\{x\}\,, \end{cases}$$

where η is the inward unit normal vector to ∂M. Suppose that $u \in L^q(\mathcal{U})$ for some $q > \frac{n}{n-2}$ and $u, \psi u \in L^1(\mathcal{U} \cap \partial M)$. Then u is a weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0\,, & \text{in } \mathcal{U}\,, \\ (\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} + \psi)u = 0\,, & \text{on } \mathcal{U} \cap \partial M\,. \end{cases}$$

The proof of the following lemma is similar to the result in [22], p.150 (see also [4], p.108).

Lemma 9.2. *Let $\rho > 0$ be small and suppose that $\rho \leq \beta \leq \beta - \rho \leq \alpha \leq n - \rho$. Then there is $C = C(n, \rho) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y - x|^{\beta - n}(1 + |x|)^{-\alpha} dx \leq C(1 + |y|)^{\beta - \alpha}$$

for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \supset \mathbb{R}^n$.

For the proof we decompose $\mathbb{R}^n$ in three regions
$\mathcal{A} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, |x - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|y| + \frac{1}{2}\}$,
$\mathcal{B} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, |x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2}|y| + \frac{1}{2}, |x| \leq 2|y| + 1\}$,
$\mathcal{C} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n;\, |x| \geq 2|y| + 1\}$,
and perform the estimates in each one separately.

The following Harnack-type inequality was proved in [23] (Lemma A.1):

Lemma 9.3. *Let L be an operator of the form*

$$Lu = \partial_a \left(\alpha_{ab}(x)\partial_a u + \beta_a(x)u\right) + \gamma_a(x)\partial_a u + \zeta(x)u$$

and assume that for some constant $\Lambda > 1$ the coefficients satisfy

$$\Lambda^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq \alpha_{ab}\xi_a\xi_b \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2,$$

$$|\beta_a(x)| + |\gamma_a(x)| + |\zeta(x)| \leq \Lambda,$$

for all $x \in B_3^+ = B_3^+(0)$ *and all* $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$*. If* $|q(x)| \leq \Lambda$*, for any* $x \in \partial' B_3^+$*, and* $u \in C^2(B_3^+) \cap C^1(\overline{B_3^+})$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} Lu = 0, \;\; u > 0, & \text{in } B_3^+, \\ \alpha_{nb}(x)\partial_b u = q(x)u, & \text{on } \partial' B_3^+, \end{cases}$$

then there exists $C = C(n, \Lambda) > 1$ *such that*

$$\max_{\overline{B_1^+}} u \leq C \min_{\overline{B_1^+}} u \,.$$

Next we will perform some computations.

Lemma 9.4. *We have:*

(a) $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^m} = \frac{2m}{\alpha+1} \int_0^\infty \frac{s^{\alpha+2} ds}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}}$ *, for* $\alpha + 1 < 2m$*;*

(b) $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^m} = \frac{2m}{2m-\alpha-1} \int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}}$ *, for* $\alpha + 1 < 2m$*;*

(c) $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^m} = \frac{2m-\alpha-3}{\alpha+1} \int_0^\infty \frac{s^{\alpha+2} ds}{(1+s^2)^m}$ *, for* $\alpha + 3 < 2m$*.*

Proof. Integrating by parts,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{\alpha+2} ds}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}} = \int_0^\infty s^{\alpha+1} \frac{s\, ds}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}} = \frac{\alpha+1}{2m} \int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^m} \,,$$

for $\alpha + 1 < 2m$, which proves the item (a).

The item (b) follows from the item (a) and from

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^m} = \int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha (1+s^2)}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}} ds = \int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}} + \int_0^\infty \frac{s^{\alpha+2} ds}{(1+s^2)^{m+1}} \,.$$

To prove the item (c), observe that, by the item (a),

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^{m-1}} = \frac{2(m-1)}{\alpha+1} \int_0^\infty \frac{s^{\alpha+2} ds}{(1+s^2)^m} \,,$$

for $\alpha + 3 < 2m$. But, by the item (b), we have

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^{m-1}} = \frac{2(m-1)}{2(m-1)-\alpha-1} \int_0^\infty \frac{s^\alpha ds}{(1+s^2)^m} \,.$$

□

Corollary 9.1. *Set* $I = \int_0^\infty \frac{s^n}{(s^2+1)^n} ds$*. Then*

(i) $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^2+(t^2-1)}{(s^2+(t+1)^2)^{n+1}} s^n ds = I \left\{ \frac{n+1}{2n}(t+1)^{1-n} + \frac{n-1}{2n}(t^2-1)(t+1)^{-1-n} \right\}$*;*
(ii) $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^2+(t^2-1)}{(s^2+(t+1)^2)^n} s^{n-2} ds = I \left\{ (t+1)^{1-n} + (t^2-1)(t+1)^{-1-n} \right\}$*;*
(iii) $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^2+(t^2-1)}{(s^2+(t+1)^2)^{n-1}} s^{n-2} ds = I \left\{ 2\frac{n-1}{n-3}(t+1)^{3-n} + 2(t^2-1)(t+1)^{1-n} \right\}$*.*

Proof. By a change of variables we get

$$\int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^2+(t^2-1)}{(s^2+(t+1)^2)^{n+1}} s^n ds = (t+1)^{1-n} \int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^{n+2}}{(s^2+1)^{n+1}} ds + (t^2-1)(t+1)^{-1-n} \int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^n}{(s^2+1)^{n+1}} ds,$$
$$\int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^2+(t^2-1)}{(s^2+(t+1)^2)^{n}} s^{n-2} ds = (t+1)^{1-n} \int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^{n}}{(s^2+1)^{n}} ds + (t^2-1)(t+1)^{-1-n} \int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^{n-2}}{(s^2+1)^{n}} ds,$$
$$\int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^2+(t^2-1)}{(s^2+(t+1)^2)^{n-1}} s^{n-2} ds = (t+1)^{3-n} \int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^{n}}{(s^2+1)^{n-1}} ds + (t^2-1)(t+1)^{1-n} \int_0^\infty \tfrac{s^{n-2}}{(s^2+1)^{n-1}} ds.$$

Then we use Lemma 9.4 to see that $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{n+2}}{(s^2+1)^{n+1}} = \frac{n+1}{2n} I$, $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{n}}{(s^2+1)^{n+1}} = \frac{n-1}{2n} I$, $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{n-2}}{(s^2+1)^{n}} = I$, $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{n}}{(s^2+1)^{n-1}} = 2\frac{n-1}{n-3} I$ and $\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{n-2}}{(s^2+1)^{n-1}} = 2I$. □

Lemma 9.5. *We have,*

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{t^k}{(1+t)^m} dt = \frac{k!}{(m-1)...(m-1-k)}\,.$$

Proof. Integrating by parts,

$$\int_0^\infty t^{k-1}(1+t)^{1-m} dt = \frac{m-1}{k} \int_0^\infty t^k (1+t)^{-m} dt\,.$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_0^\infty t^{k-1}(1+t)^{1-m} dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{t^{k-1}(1+t)}{(1+t)^m} dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{t^k}{(1+t)^m} dt + \int_0^\infty \frac{t^{k-1}}{(1+t)^m} dt\,.$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{t^k}{(1+t)^m} dt = \frac{k}{m-1-k} \int_0^\infty \frac{t^{k-1}}{(1+t)^m} dt\,.$$

Now the result follows observing that $\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(1+t)^m} dt = \frac{1}{m-1}$. □

References

[1] Almaraz, S.: Existence and compactness theorems for the Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary. Doctoral thesis, IMPA, Brazil (2009)

[2] Ambrosetti, A., Li, Y., Malchiodi, A.: On the Yamabe problem and the scalar curvature problem under boundary condtions. Math. Ann. **322**(4), 667-699 (2002)

[3] Aubin, T.: Équations différentielles non linéaires et probléme de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire. J. Math. Pures Appl. **55**, 269-296 (1976)

[4] Aubin, T., Some Nonlinear Problems in Riemannian Geometry. Springer monographs in mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1998)

[5] Berti, M., Malchiodi, A.: Non-compactness and multiplicity results for the Yamabe problem on S^n. J. Funct. Anal. **180**(1), 210-241 (2001)

[6] Brendle, S.: Convergence of the Yamabe flow in dimension 6 and higher. Invent. Math. **170**(3), 541-576 (2007).

[7] Brendle, S.: Blow-up phenomena for the Yamabe equation. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **21**(4), 951-979 (2008)

[8] Brendle, S., Marques, F.: Blow-up phenomena for the Yamabe equation II. J. Differential Geom. **81**, 225-250 (2009)

[9] Chen, C.-C., Lin, C.-S.: Estimates of the scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes. J. Differential Geom. **49**,115-178 (1998)

[10] Cherrier, P.: Problèmes de Neumann non linéaires sur les variétés Riemannienes. J. Funct. Anal. **57**, 154-206 (1984)

[11] Chipot, M., Shafrir, I., Fila, M.: On the solutions to some elliptic equations with nonlinear Neumann boundary conditions. Adv. Differential Equations **1**(1), 91-110 (1996)

[12] Djadli, Z., Malchiodi, A., Ould Ahmedou, M.: Prescribing scalar and boundary mean curvature on the three dimensional half sphere. J. Geom. Anal. **13**(2), 255-289 (2003)

[13] Djadli, Z., Malchiodi, A., Ould Ahmedou, M.: The prescribed boundary mean curvature poblem on $\mathbb{B}^4$. J. Differential Equations **206**(2), 373-398 (2004)

[14] Druet, O.: From one bubble to several bubbles: the low-dimensional case. J. Differential Geom. **63**(3), 399-473 (2003)

[15] Druet, O.: Compactness for Yamabe metrics in low dimensions. Int. Math. Res. Not. **23**, 1143-1191 (2004)

[16] Escobar, J.: Uniqueness theorems on conformal deformation of metrics, Sobolev inequalities, and an eigenvalue estimate. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **43**(7), 857-883 (1990)

[17] Escobar, J.: The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary. J. Differential Geom. **35**, 21-84 (1992)

[18] Escobar, J.: Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a scalar flat metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary. Ann. Math. **136**, 1-50 (1992)

[19] Escobar, J.: Conformal metrics with prescribed mean curvature on the boundary. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4**, 559-592 (1996)

[20] Felli, V., Ould Ahmedou, M.: Compactness results in conformal deformations of Riemannian metrics on manifolds with boundaries. Math. Z. **244**, 175-210 (2003)

[21] Felli, V., Ould Ahmedou, M.: A geometric equation with critical nonlinearity on the boundary. Pacific J. Math. **218**(1), 75-99(2005)

[22] Giraud, G.: Sur la problème de Dirichlet généralisé. Ann. Sci. Ècole Norm. Sup. (3) **46**, 131-145 (1929)

[23] Han, Z., Li, Y.: The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary: existence and compactness results. Duke Math. J. **99**(3), 489-542 (1999)

[24] Hebey, E., Vaugon, M.: Le problème de Yamabe équivariant. Bull. Sci. Math. **117**(2), 241-286 (1993)

[25] Hu, B.: Nonexistence of a positive solution of the Laplace equation with nonlinear boundary condition. Differential and Integral Equations **7**, 301-313 (1994)

[26] Khuri, M., Marques, F., Schoen, R.: A compactness theorem for the Yamabe problem. J. Differential Geom. **81**(1), 143-196 (2009)

[27] Lee, J., Parker, T.: The Yamabe problem. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **17**, 37-91 (1987)

[28] Li, Y., Zhang, M.: Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem, II. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **24**, 185-237 (2005)

[29] Li, Y., Zhang, M.: Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem, III. J. Funct. Anal. **245**(2), 438-474 (2007)

[30] Li, Y., Zhu, M.: Uniqueness theorems through the method of moving spheres. Duke Math. J. **80**(2), 383-417 (1995)

[31] Li, Y., Zhu, M.: Yamabe type equations on three dimensional Riemannian manifolds. Commun. Contemp. Math. **1**(1), 1-50 (1999)

[32] Marques, F.: A priori estimates for the Yamabe problem in the non-locally conformally flat case. J. Differential Geom. **71**, 315-346 (2005)

[33] Marques, F.: Existence results for the Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **54**(6), 1599-1620 (2005)

[34] Marques, F.: Conformal deformation to scalar flat metrics with constant mean curvature on the boundary Comm. Anal. Geom. **15**(2), 381-405 (2007)

[35] Nirenberg, L.: Topics in Nonlinear Functional Analysis, lecture notes, 1973-1974. Courant Institute publication, New York (1974)

[36] Schoen, R.: Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature. J. Diffrential Geom. **20**, 479-495 (1984)

[37] Schoen, R.: Courses at Stanford University (1989)

[38] Schoen, R.: On the number of constant scalar curvature metrics in a conformal class. Differential Geometry: A sysposium in honor of Manfredo Do Carmo (H.B.Lawson and K.Tenenblat, eds.), Wiley, 311-320 (1991)

[39] Schoen, R., Yau, S.-T.: *Lectures on Differential Geometry,* Conference Proceedings and Lecture Notes in Geometry and Topology, I. International Press, Cambridge (1994)

[40] Schoen, R., Zhang, D.: Prescribed scalar curvature on the n-sphere. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4**(1), 1-25 (1996)

[41] Trudinger, N.: Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of a Riemannian structure on compact manifolds. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) **22**, 265-274 (1968)

[42] Yamabe, H.: On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds. Osaka Math. J. **12**, 21-37 (1960)

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, NITERÓI, RJ, BRAZIL
E-mail address: **almaraz@impa.br**